



## Rep. Tom Emmer on THE SQUAWK BOX

CNBC

Broadcast: March 06, 2025 • Duration: 8:52

---

**\*\*JOE:**

\*\* House Majority Whip, Tom Emmert, and Majority Whip, Congressman, you don't call someone like a whip, do you? Whip Emmer? We just, is Congressman, is that what we go with? We do leadership. Go ahead.

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**

\*\* Everybody around here, Joe, calls me either whip or something that I can't repeat on this program.

**\*\*JOE:**

\*\* Really? I'm going to do whip then. Because if you're, they love, they love when I call people leader. They love when they call people leader. They love, oh, a leader this, leader hoy, they love when you call it leader. I'm just going to call you Congressman, so.

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**

\*\* You can call me whatever you want, Joe. Just call me for dinner.

**\*\*JOE:**

\*\* I saw an article the other day, it was so disingenuous, Congressman. It was somewhere where they said, oh, the pushback, these guys were really hearing it. And I looked at it, it was all Democrats that were crashing the local congressional meeting. But you're not going to see that. They're going to say, oh my God, even, you know, all of his constituents are, are angry about Doge. I still think there's a, what's the public opinion on, on Doge right now? Would you say, Congressman? Just as a guess.

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**

\*\* Well, I would say anecdotally, based on what I'm hearing back from my district, it's about a 70, 75% excited and happy that this is actually happening. They've been waiting for it for a long time. And you're right. We've got these activists, many of them are paid activists. They represent different groups that have been making their money off the government for decades and they don't want to see this happen. So they're literally trying to create some opposition that just doesn't exist. And I would, I would go back to the president's speech the other night, which they wanted to pan. They wanted to be negative about it. I think depending on which poll you were looking at, 68 to 76% of Americans thought that was great. That's exactly what they want to hear. He made promises, Joe, and he is delivering on those promises and the Americans have voted for him. 77 million Americans are really happy about it.

**\*\*JOE:**

\*\* There, there's a couple of, of side issues to talk about. The Supreme Court, um, Roberts and Coney Barrett, and if you read the dissent from the four conservatives, they're like, this is a district court judge. You're going to



let a district court judge have the decision to ship \$2 billion off that we'll never going to get back. How does, how does that make sense? Was that a setback for, for these efforts? Do you think Congressman?

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**

\*\* No, I, my, and by the way, Kai, the full disclosure, I have not read the opinion yet. I think that is very important so that I understand exactly what the, uh, what the analysis was. But I'm going to tell you, it could be a setback for the Supreme Court. They have to start recognizing this separation of powers, which they seem to do in every other area. Uh, again, this one may have a legal basis, but like you say, uh, I haven't read it yet and I haven't read the dissent. I don't think it's a setback at all. I think it is actually what the public wants to see. And I just, I think, uh, we gotta be very careful because it's the rule of law that matters. Uh, but it's the application as well. And for far too long, I think the, uh, the electorate, a big group that are supporting for Trump believes that some of our, uh, our judges on the bench are more, uh, pseudo legislators, which is not what they're supposed to be.

**\*\*JOE:**

\*\* Do you see, do you see any evidence that there could be some negative consequences? Probably you would not like the way I characterize it with, with a shoot first, uh, ask questions later. I mean, some of this, it's almost like we don't know if, if what we're cutting is going to have a bad effect until we try it. And then we hear about the bad effect. Is it, is it worth it to do it that way, to, to go headlong into it without thinking about the consequences? That's the criticism that you hear from the other side as well.

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**

\*\* Of course you do. And I, I mean, I get it. Elon Musk made a point to our members last night that, uh, they're not going to be batting 1000% on everything. And he made a very, uh, direct, uh, request that if you have specific issues with constituents, get in touch with him directly. Let him know, I literally, uh, this has to happen. I would argue, Joe, uh, the American public's been waiting for this for 30 years. And if you're not going to go after the waste, fraud and abuse in government, if you're not going to try and reform it so that it gets back to serving the people instead of ruling over them, you're going to have to do some of this. And then it's up to us, the legislators working with our constituents at home, when there is that instance where something good got caught up with all this bad. And I would blame the people by the way, that turned our federal government into their personal ATM for their political agenda for putting all the good stuff at risk too. But it'll be up to us to work with Elon Musk and Doge, uh, but more importantly with the White House to let them know that, uh, this one is important. This serves the mission of our federal government. Uh, and you, uh, you went a little too far with whatever it is and then we'll see where it goes.

**\*\*ANDREW:**

\*\* Majority whip. One of the big questions I think that the American public may have, they may not have it yet, but I think that they're going to have, you may disagree with me is whatever you think the short, at minimum, the short term pain of these tariffs ultimately turns into as it relates to jobs, as it relates to additional costs for goods and the like. And just what, when you talk to your own constituents, how they feel about that, how long you think that they will be willing to put up with it, assuming you believe as I, I, I would like to think, and I know the president thinks that there's a rainbow on the other side, but to get there, uh, might be more challenging than, than some people want.

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**



\*\* Andrew, I would never disagree with you, but I will say on this one, I, the president, I don't think it's the rainbow on the other side. The president is actually fighting for the American people. It's a simple message. It, the message is, if you want to do business with us, then you need to treat our producers. You need to treat our imports the way we treat yours. Uh, it's as simple as that. We will treat you as you treat us. And by the way, the cost of them treating us the way we treat them, oddly enough, could be higher.

**\*\*ANDREW:**

\*\* Meaning the American public may ultimately have to actually pay more for that rather than less.

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**

\*\* Uh, Andrew, I'm not disputing that. Uh, there may be some short time disruption that's going to result in some negative impacts. No question. Uh, but this is the point. And if you think, if you or others think that this is going to somehow, uh, reduce the president's popularity, think again. He has campaigned on this. He made a point to the American people. They don't care about you. We want free trade, but we want it to be fair and he is trying to make it fair. So I got a governor at home who's totally incompetent, who's saying that Trump doesn't care about the farmers. Well, I got news for him. What Trump is trying to do is make sure that our dairy industry has full and free access to the Canadian market, just like we give the Canadians full and free access to a fair access to the U S markets in the, in the short term. Could that cause some disruption and problems? Yes. In the longterm, it's the best thing you could do for the greatest producers on the face of the planet, right here in the United States of America.

**\*\*JOE:**

\*\* Whip ever, um, just from Minnesota. I just don't understand. I mean, is that the same state as Tim, Tim waltz and, uh, Ken Martin and, and Al Frank. Where'd you come from? How did it, I don't even think Minnesota, Minnesota didn't even vote for Reagan. That's the only state. I mean, are you like, uh, do you, do you, are you usually in, in, uh, go around incognito or are you okay there? You got any, you got some Republicans around?

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**

\*\* You'd be surprised. You'd be surprised. Our, uh, our governor who should be done. I mean, he embarrassed us and himself on the national stage with that, uh, failed, uh, presidential run. I, our governor won reelection just barely. A fact of the matter is he only won 13 counties out of, uh, out of, uh, 87. He lost the 74. He lost. He got 37% of the vote, Joe. So it's much closer than people think. And our 13 county, that's all I got to say. That's all I got to say to you. Don't Al Franken. I mean, he still has me laughing.

**\*\*JOE:**

\*\* I'm only kidding. I love minister. I love the Vikings. Love. Love the state. Love all the lakes. Um, love you. Thank you. Uh, good. Good to have you on this morning. Mr. Whip.

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**

\*\* Appreciate you guys. Okay. Thank you.



This transcript was independently produced by MN-06 Watch for accountability and archival purposes.

Source: CNBC (March 06, 2025)

Archived: February 05, 2026

Source URL: <https://youtu.be/9Dag84zKKkc>

For questions or corrections: [mn06watch@gmail.com](mailto:mn06watch@gmail.com)