

is only \$26 and is usually repaid within a few days, but many large banks charge \$35 a fee per overdraft. That works out to an annual percentage of about more than 16,000 percent.

So I want you to imagine that you are walking into a 7-Eleven. You are a little short on cash. You want to buy a cup of coffee. You go to the ATM machine. You take out 50 bucks. You buy a \$2.50 cup of coffee, but it costs you about \$40; and you don't even know it because the bank doesn't tell you.

And then the next day you go to buy some groceries. This time you use your debit card, and they charge you another 35 bucks and don't tell you you have overdrawn.

Well, these fees fall hardest on families living paycheck to paycheck. Federal law requires that these banks can charge an overdraft fee on these withdrawals only if consumers opt in—if they opt in. But many financial institutions use deceptive tricks and confusing fine print to get consumers to enter into these programs and then do not inform them of the costs. And banks not that long ago made about \$30 billion in one year from these overdraft fees.

So in 2024, the CFPB issued guidelines requiring banks to show proof that one of our constituents—one of our consumers—actually opted in, and that is what the Trump administration got rid of. They got rid of the enforcement mechanism that prevents our consumers from being gouged.

I know a 35-buck fee is a drop in the bucket for Trump and his billionaire buddies. I know he is focused on his billion-dollar ballroom, but we need to focus on our constituents.

And I will close with this. Just yesterday, President Trump said:

I don't think about Americans' financial situation.

Well, when they got rid of this rule, he proved he did not care about the financial situation of people living paycheck to paycheck. We should care. I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Duckworth	Kaine
Baldwin	Durbin	Kelly
Bennet	Fetterman	Kim
Blumenthal	Gallego	King
Blunt Rochester	Gillibrand	Klobuchar
Booker	Hassan	Luján
Cantwell	Heinrich	Markey
Coons	Hickenlooper	Merkley
Cortez Masto	Hirono	Murphy

Murray	Schatz	Warner
Ossoff	Schiff	Warnock
Padilla	Schumer	Warren
Peters	Shaheen	Welch
Reed	Slotkin	Whitehouse
Rosen	Smith	Wyden
Sanders	Van Hollen	

NAYS—53

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

The motion was rejected.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "FAIR CREDIT REPORTING; BACKGROUND SCREENING"—Motion to Proceed

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 389, S.J. Res. 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 389, S.J. Res. 133, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Credit Reporting; Background Screening".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 2 minutes.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Tariffs, a war, and a golden ballroom. We are in the middle of an economic crisis in America, but instead of working with us to help bring down costs, this administration weakened the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, gutting protections and making it harder for Americans to afford daily life.

The unemployment rate is 4.3 percent and rising. Our housing market is in turmoil. Bottom line: Americans are struggling to get jobs, rent apartments, and secure mortgages. And the last thing they need to deal with is inaccurate background screening reports. This is especially true for those seeking a fresh start. My resolution would address that.

Now, we have all been there where you have submitted your paperwork, you sit for an interview, you provide references, and you are just waiting for the background check. This should be a

breeze, right? Well, for many Americans it is not that easy—especially for our returning citizens.

That is why red States and blue States across the country have recognized the need to address a portion of this problem passing clean-slate legislation to give people a fair shot and a fresh start.

The Biden CFPB issued guidance to crack down on inaccurate background screening reports, but the Trump administration withdrew this guidance stating it was too onerous. You know what is onerous? Jumping through hoops to prove your background check was wrong while hoping to get an apartment that you applied for is still available. Or fighting with the credit bureau to prove you have a clean record to keep your job—that is onerous.

It has been proven that protecting consumers from error-filled background checks can be done. Equifax—one of the big three credit bureaus—recognized the importance and continued to handle customer complaints, despite the Trump administration's rescission of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. The Federal Government should do the same, and I urge my colleagues to join us because nobody deserves to lose their job or their home because of false or outdated information.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

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

Clearly, the noes have it. The motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "FAIR CREDIT REPORTING; PERMISSIBLE PURPOSES FOR FURNISHING, USING, AND OBTAINING CONSUMER REPORTS"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 394, S.J. Res. 145.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 394, S.J. Res. 145, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Credit Reporting; Permissible Purposes for Furnishing, Using, and Obtaining Consumer Reports".

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a joint resolution of disapproval that would restore critical privacy protections for consumers that the Trump administration did away with.

The Fair Credit Reporting Act is one of our foremost laws aimed at protecting the privacy of the American people. The law requires that a consumer report, like a credit report or a background check, can only be provided if the report's requestor, like a creditor, landlord, or employer, certifies that it has a permissible purpose to obtain a report on a specific person.

Despite these requirements, far too many Americans have been subjected to serious, outrageous breaches of privacy when companies sharing the report for one person include information pertaining to someone else.

In 2022, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—our Nation's consumer watchdog—took action to protect Americans' privacy and crack down by issuing new guidance on the rules that surround crucial credit report privacy.

The advisory opinion did something that ought to be common sense: It made it clear that your sensitive financial information couldn't be shared with landlords, loan sharks, or used car salesmen just because you had a similar name to somebody else.

Once your credit info is in the wrong hands, scammers, criminals, and shady data brokers can easily use your personal information, and then they go rip you off.

This was a huge win for consumer privacy, and Donald Trump gutted it.

I will close with this: My resolution is simple. It would restore this advisory opinion that Trump withdrew as part of this administration's ongoing war against consumers and privacy.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in rolling back Trump's war on consumers by supporting this joint resolution that will once again restore important privacy measures for the American people.

I yield the floor.

VOICE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

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

It appears the noes have it. The motion is rejected.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "TRUTH IN LENDING (REGULATION Z); CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR HOME SALES FINANCED UNDER CONTRACTS FOR DEED"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 396, S.J. Res. 149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 396, S.J. Res. 149, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Consumer Protections for Home Sales Financed Under Contracts for Deed".

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—CFPB—has played a critical role on the side of people to help them avoid junk fees, predatory medical debt, payday lenders who take advantage of people in need, including so many of our military servicemembers.

So it should come as no surprise that Donald Trump is no fan of the CFPB—he has always sided with big special interests over average folks—and he has undermined its protections for the American people.

Senate Democrats have made clear time and time again: Donald Trump's policies are one big broken promise in lowering costs to the American people.

Trump undermining consumer protections is just another example of Trump's betrayal—betrayal—of working people.

So today I am defending the CFPB for the same reason I helped authorize it years ago: American consumers need to have someone—someone—in their corner. This is a critical tool to reducing people's everyday costs from healthcare and banking to housing.

So I am heading up this joint resolution of disapproval with many of my colleagues against the Trump administration's decision to reverse CFPB protections on mortgage lending called contract for deed transactions that without the proper guardrails can devolve into predatory practices against Americans trying to buy a home.

For millions of Americans who can't access a traditional mortgage, a contract for deed can seem like a lifeline, but too often, these arrangements are simply traps.

The buyer takes on every obligation of home ownership immediately—the taxes, the repairs, the risks—but doesn't receive the deed until they pay every last dollar.

This is a formula for failure. Miss a single payment, and you can lose everything—no equity, no recourse, evicted like a tenant. Mr. President, 200,000 New Yorkers are in this position. We must stop it, and I urge a yes vote.

I yield the floor.

VOICE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

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

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it. The motion is rejected.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "FAIR CREDIT REPORTING; NAME-ONLY MATCHING PROCEDURES"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. WARNOCK. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 392, S.J. Res. 140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 392, S.J. Res. 140, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Credit Reporting; Name-Only Matching Procedures".

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I rise today in support of my resolution to restore CFPB guidance that prevented mistaken identity on credit reports, which can destroy someone's credit through no fault of their own.

Credit and background reports are incredibly important to the lives of Americans. The difference between good credit and bad credit can decide whether someone gets a house, an apartment, or a job. It determines how much money they will spend in order to afford a house.

These reports may include criminal records or eviction records, so they need to be accurate.

If they are inaccurate because of lazy name-matching practices, they can result in you being denied a job or apartment based on the wrong person's criminal or eviction record—a case of mistaken identity. And by the time you figure out what went wrong and jump through all the hoops to fix the problem, it is often too late for that job or apartment.

The CFPB, under the previous administration, tried to fix this problem by saying companies need more than just someone's name to identify someone, but the Trump administration has torn up this guidance and made the lives of ordinary folks harder—harder to get a job, harder to find an apartment. I don't get it.

I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on my resolution to restore this simple guidance to stop credit report mistaken identity by companies and debt collectors.

I yield the floor.

VOICE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

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

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it. The motion is rejected.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.