

abuse, and corruption in Medicaid and food stamps and government social programs, every Democrat in the Senate voted no. They must love the corruption—which brings us to Minnesota.

Yesterday, Congress exposed worrying new information about the vast extent of the massive fraud and corruption in the State of Minnesota. Minnesota Governor Tim Walz, who was the Democrat Vice Presidential nominee in 2024, and his attorney general, Keith Ellison, who was the deputy chair of the Democratic National Committee, are presiding over one of the most outrageous fraud scandals in recent memory. Manipulative criminals have stolen billions of dollars from Federal programs—billions meant to help vulnerable Americans.

Republicans voted to put more money in people's pockets. That is not what the Democrats wanted. No. They voted to raise taxes and voted to protect the kind of fraud being exposed in Minnesota today, the kind of fraud that Democrat-elected officials refuse to see and refuse to stop.

The working families tax cuts are part of the broader economic agenda that is already working, and the numbers prove it. Today, the world's most successful companies are investing in this country—\$10 trillion in America. Record investment is driving private sector job growth. It is driving innovation. It is driving opportunity.

The proof is that the economy grew 4.3 percent in the third quarter. That is the strongest economic growth in 2 years. Core inflation cooled in November to 2.6 percent. Gasoline is now less than \$3 per gallon in most of the country. In Casper, WY, it was \$1.91. Forecasters predict prices are going to continue to fall. Real wages are on track to grow over by \$1,000 this year.

All of these successes happened because Republicans are committed to American prosperity. We cut taxes. We eliminated wasteful Washington spending. We rolled back burdensome regulations. We unleashed American energy. This is a 180-degree turnaround from the past 4 years under Joe Biden and the Democrats. Under Joe Biden and the Democrats, prices rose by over 20 percent in 4 years. Democrats will now go down in history as the party of high prices, high taxes, and open borders.

As Americans celebrate the 250th anniversary of our Nation, we can be confident—confident—that our country is safer, is stronger, and more prosperous. And with the Working Families Tax Cuts, Republicans are making sure that that prosperity continues into the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3229

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, here is a fact that Donald Trump seems to not understand or care about: families in Nevada and all across this country being squeezed—being squeezed—by high costs. Nevadans are struggling to

afford even the most basic things from groceries to rent to healthcare.

This isn't just in Nevada. All across the country, housing costs are up; healthcare costs are up. Even the most basic, unavoidable expenses like electricity have even gotten more expensive. But if you ask Donald Trump, he says affordability—and I am going to quote here—is a "hoax." It is a "con job by the Democrats." He even said—and I am going to quote again—"prices are coming down tremendously . . . inflation is stopped."

I am going to ask everybody here at home today: Do you think affordability is a hoax? Do you feel like prices are going down? Don't listen to Trump. Just take one look at your grocery bill this week. It is clear he isn't paying attention to hard-working people because the price of your groceries has done nothing but skyrocket.

Donald Trump, he ran for President on lowering prices. Since he got into office nearly a year ago, Americans have spent on average well over \$1,000 more because of Trump's cost-raising tariffs. He was supposed to lower prices on day one. Well, we are a lot further than day one.

I want to be clear about what these tariffs really are. They are an additional tax on hard-working families, and they increase prices across the board. Just look at housing. Due to Trump's tariff taxes, the price of construction materials, appliances, and furniture have skyrocketed, gone through the roof. When you raise the cost of lumber, steel, and other materials builders rely on to build new homes, you slow down construction. And when supply can't keep up with demand, prices go up. That is not just ideology; that is simple economics.

Similarly, Trump's self-imposed taxes have increased your costs at the grocery store. You are paying more for the essentials you rely on most: coffee, produce, meat, so much more. Trump and his billionaire buddies, who probably haven't gone grocery shopping for themselves in years, don't care about the price of groceries. Well, they might not care about paying more, but seniors on fixed incomes do; parents trying to feed their kids do; workers whose paychecks aren't keeping up do. They are the ones being hurt by these reckless tariffs. So Donald Trump may not care, but everyone else I know cares—and it matters.

That is why I introduced my No Tariffs on Groceries Act. This bill, it is simple—simple. It would exempt your groceries from Trump's tariffs, meaning the costs won't be raised because of the tariffs. So it is time that Congress reasserts its authority over trade and pushes back against Trump's cost-raising tariffs.

I know a few things: Groceries are not a luxury; food should never be a bargaining chip; and working families should not be collateral damage in Trump's reckless trade wars. This hits everyone at the kitchen table. Every

person needs to eat. You shouldn't be collateral damage in Trump's reckless trade wars. Let's prove this Chamber can still act on the issues that are most important to American families at their kitchen table. If they care about that and they want to lower costs for everybody, let's pass my bill right now.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 3229 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the Rosen substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise in opposition to S. 3229, the No Tariffs on Groceries Act of 2025.

The reason groceries are so expensive is because during the last administration, inflation got totally out of control. We all know the grocery prices went up then. That is when the inflation rates were in double digits. I think at one point, they got over 20 percent.

Where is the inflation rate today? My colleagues on the other side would like to try to duck the fact that the reason grocery prices are so high is because of the inflation that was caused under President Biden's administration when we blew the top off of growth and the prices. Today, the inflation rate is at 2.7 percent, close to the Federal Reserve's target for our economy. That is just a fact that we have to recognize and deal with.

Now, this bill seeks to exempt articles of food from the President's IEEPA tariffs. I agree with my colleagues that tariffs generally should be targeted as much as possible to avoid harm to Americans. We also should consider more exemptions to harms arising from potential unintended consequences, including exemptions for unavailable natural resources.

The administration agrees. In November, the administration excluded a number of food items from the reciprocal, India, and Brazil IEEPA tariffs. By all accounts, the administration is working to identify similar exemptions in other active trade negotiations. I strongly encourage the President to pursue productive courses of engagement with U.S. stakeholders in doing so, but voting for one-off exemptions on the Senate floor in isolation of a larger negotiating strategy and broader stakeholder concerns like this bill S. 3229 asks us to do now, does not facilitate a predictable process for our negotiators or for any broader segment of stakeholder engagement.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, food should never be a bargaining chip. People's kitchen tables, their refrigerators should never be a bargaining chip. This is not a partisan issue, feeding people in the United States. We should not be mixing natural resources with the essential things that we need like food.

Are my Republican colleagues—if they want to lower prices, they can start—they can start—by this one small act of letting this bill go through. They can help me lower prices right here, right now. I am very disappointed. This bill would lower prices at the grocery store for hard-working families all across America. And by stopping it from passing, you and your Republican colleagues—well, I am afraid you are telling the American people that their kitchen table isn't your priority and that Washington Republicans would rather bow to Trump than pass legislation to lower at least one section of grocery prices and make food more affordable for their constituents.

Again, this isn't partisan. People in my State and yours are being crushed by rising costs. Washington Republicans have the power to do a little something about it, but they choose not to. So if you really want to do what is right by your constituents, if you want to do right by kitchen tables across this country, Republicans would stand up to Trump, stand up against these reckless tariffs on food, and support my legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

MINNESOTA ICE SHOOTING

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, tomorrow is Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, and it was my intention to come to the floor today and talk about some great officers and celebrate the men and women that put their lives on the line to protect us every day. Indeed, I encourage every American across this great Nation to do just that, say thank you for signing up courageously for an often thankless job. But in light of recent events, I feel I must address a more pressing issue.

The horrific situation that occurred yesterday morning in Minnesota is tragic. Radical protestors intending to run over Federal immigration officers with cars, that cannot happen. In fact, protestors that show up with intent to harass or obstruct or impede or aggressively approach or violently assault officers, it cannot happen.

When they are doing their jobs, it is a precarious, often dangerous, situation. I can tell you that firsthand as the wife of a law enforcement officer. I beg anyone thinking about participating in this kind of behavior to think twice for all involved.

They must be given space to focus. It is a very dangerous situation in some of these missions and law enforcement activities. That is why I introduced the Halo Act back in November because, as

I saw the threats of political violence, of threats against our law enforcement officers were rapidly increasing, I knew that we had to do something. And so I introduced the Halo Act so that one of these events wouldn't occur.

I don't know how officers are able to do their jobs with people impeding them and getting in their faces as they are trying to focus on executing their duties.

It is deeply troubling to hear the anti-law enforcement rhetoric being used by so many when it comes to Federal officers simply trying to show up and do the jobs that we, as a nation, hired them to do.

And what happened yesterday in terms of folks showing up with the intent to obstruct officers, that is not an isolated incident. It is part of this broader pattern of coordinated efforts, encouraged by elected politicians who keep increasing their rhetoric and almost encouraging—let me just take the "almost" out, encouraging people to get in the way of law enforcement officers trying to do their job, knowing how dangerous that is, not only dangerous for law enforcement officers but for those who show up and try to impede their efforts.

Elected Democrat officials right now are using radical rhetoric and encouraging people in their cities and their States to harass and obstruct officers. Many of them are even using taxpayer funds to help speak out and coordinate. According to the Department of Homeland Security, assaults on police are up 1,300 percent, death threats on police up 8,000 percent.

This alarming trend threatens public safety and the rule of law—the rule of law—and the expectation that we would support the men and women who uphold it. That is what is attracting people from around the United States of America to my home State, the great free State of Florida, because we support them. We protect our officers. In fact, we introduced legislation and passed legislation to give them a safety zone, a buffer zone to do their jobs and do them safely.

The Halo Act, which I introduced 2 months ago, will ensure that Federal officers can perform their duties without fear of intimidation, interference, or violence. The legislation would make it illegal for anyone, after being asked, told to stand back, to knowingly come within 25 feet of an officer who is doing their job if their intent is to interfere with the officer's work or threaten them with physical harm.

It is modeled after a law in Florida, and we know it will work. It will provide the necessary buffer zone to allow officers to focus on the execution of their duties, and that is what is safe for everyone.

Essentially, the bill would institute the zones and keep the officers safe. It would also make sure that this buffer zone or safety zone is there to protect others.

I implore my colleagues to join in this mission, in this proposed legisla-

tion, and cosponsor the Halo Act. It is obvious we must act now to protect these officers that protect us. And we must send a message that targeted attacks, interference with the duties of officers, threat, harm, violence against law enforcement must end. We owe it to our communities. We owe it to the brave people that sign up for these jobs to strengthen the protections around them.

Ahead of Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, we have to acknowledge that without the men and women that put on that badge every day, this would not be the country that we know. It is a fragile line between order and chaos, and the people that sign up to stand on that line, come what may, need to be protected, and this act would do just that.

I urge my colleagues to join me and support the Halo Act to have our officers' back, to ensure our communities are safe and that they can do their jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

WHISTLEBLOWERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I believe whistleblowing in the Federal Government should be protected and encouraged. People in the executive branch of government that work in there every day want the Federal Government to enforce the laws the way they are written and spend money according to that law.

And when they see something that is not right in government, they have a responsibility to blow the whistle and tell somebody and, hopefully, they work with the immediate superiors, but a lot of times they don't get any respect for the shortcomings of government that they expose.

Eventually, they come to Congress and at that point are covered by whistleblower protection legislation, and if we want to continue the good work that whistleblowers do to expose wrongdoing in government, particularly fraud, waste, and abuse, we should make sure that the whistleblower laws are faithfully followed.

One aspect of whistleblower protection is to make sure that everybody in government knows about whistleblowers and the protection that they can receive.

One aspect of that is what we call anti-gag rules that need to be followed. So I am here to speak about my efforts to ensure that the Federal Government complies with all whistleblower laws. Unfortunately, the government has made efforts to gag whistleblowers before they can make legally protected disclosures, including to Congress.

The illegal conduct has happened no matter which political party controls the executive branch of government. That is why I spearheaded successful efforts to get what is called anti-gag provisions enacted.

I worked for decades to make it the law. And I have worked to ensure that