

nomination of Jamieson Greer to be U.S. Trade Representative.

Mr. Greer is admirably qualified for this position. He spent most of his career specializing in trade law and has extensive international experience. He served as a missionary in Brussels, received a master's degree from two Paris institutions, served as law clerk for the European Court of Justice, and was stationed in both Türkiye and Iraq as a member of the Air Force. Most significantly of all, he spent 3 years of the previous Trump administration serving as Chief of Staff to then-U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer, who spoke highly of Mr. Greer's work. He is, in short, very well prepared for this role.

One of my top priorities when it comes to trade is expanding opportunities for our Nation's agriculture producers, like the many farmers and ranchers in my State of South Dakota.

The Biden administration frequently seemed to have no interest in trade beyond negotiating on climate and labor issues. Witness the fact that there was not a single FTA negotiated during the Biden administration—not a single one—with all the opportunities across the globe to enter into trade agreements to open up and provide access to America's farmers and ranchers and small business people. Well, that was a real disservice to America's ag producers and to our small businesses.

Trade is critical to the continued success of American agriculture. Twenty percent of U.S. ag products are exported yearly, and exports provide substantial farm income. Soybeans and corn alone accounted for 22 percent of all U.S. exports by value in 2024.

Thanks, in part, to the Biden administration's almost complete inaction on trade, the current agricultural trade deficit is at an alltime high. That is an area of our economy where we have always run trade surpluses historically. Consistently over time, decade after decade, we had always run trade surpluses in agriculture until the last few years under the Biden administration, when we started racking up not only deficits but now record trade deficits. They are at an alltime high. I have to say that is a real problem for our ag producers, especially considering the other challenges that they have been facing, and it is something that needs to be addressed.

I know that the Trump administration is committed to meeting the needs of farmers and ranchers, and I am looking forward to working with Mr. Greer to expand opportunities for our agricultural producers.

I am very encouraged by the fact that Mr. Greer has expressed his commitment to working closely with the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, and with Congress.

President Biden's Trade Representative was completely uninterested in working with Congress. So it is very encouraging to hear of Mr. Greer's commitment to communication and collaboration.

I look forward to a close partnership between the administration and Congress in the coming months and years, as we work to expand opportunities for American producers.

ENERGY

Mr. President, this afternoon, we are going to vote on a resolution to end the energy emergency that President Trump declared upon taking office.

Apparently, according to the resolution's authors, this energy emergency declaration isn't justified. In response to that, I would like to just read a headline from the Washington Post last March. That headline is:

Amid explosive demand, America is running out of power.

Let me just repeat that for my Democratic colleagues:

Amid explosive demand, America is running out of power. [Running out of power.]

The article stated:

Vast swaths of the United States are at risk of running short of power as electricity-hungry data centers and clean technology factories proliferate around the country, leaving utilities and regulators grasping for credible plans to expand the nation's creaking power grid.

Then, of course, there was this headline from another major news outlet in December:

More than half the US faces blackout risks in next decade, NERC finds.

Again:

More than half the US faces blackout risks in next decade . . .

Large swaths of the US—

The article noted—

could experience rolling blackouts due to capacity shortfalls during extreme weather events in the next decade, according to a grid reliability analysis released Tuesday.

The Midcontinent Independent System Operator faces the highest risk of energy shortfalls starting as soon as this summer, according to the report from the North American Electric Reliability Corp., which can force grid operators to trigger rolling outages to prevent wider system harm.

These aren't niche publications. These are mainstream media outlets—mainstream media outlets reporting on the fact that “America is running out of power.”

If my Democrat colleagues don't consider that an emergency, I just don't know what to say.

As these articles—and others—make clear, the U.S. electric grid is extremely shaky.

Thanks in substantial part to a movement to shut down fossil fuel-fired powerplants before reliable sources of clean energy are available to replace them, America is running out of power, even as we face huge new power demands. The boom in data center construction—in particular to power the rise of artificial intelligence—is placing, and will place, vast new demands upon the grid.

A recent CNBC headline noted:

Data centers powering artificial intelligence could use more electricity than entire cities. [. . . more electricity than entire cities.]

If we continue on our current course, there is a very real risk that we are not going to be able to meet that demand; that we are going to end up with widespread brownouts and blackouts or electricity rationing or de facto rationing forced by sky-high energy bills.

I realize that this is an inconvenient truth to my Democrat colleagues. Why? Because it interferes with their plans to force the United States off conventional energy.

If Democrats acknowledge that we are rapidly approaching an energy crisis, they might have to actually consider the consequences of their energy plans; to consider what might happen when you put immense new power demands on an already shaky grid by forcing Americans into electric vehicles; to consider what might happen if you drastically limit domestic oil and gas production, even as the Nation continues to require steady and affordable supply of conventional fuels.

So I do understand why Democrats prefer not to acknowledge our national energy emergency. But acknowledge it or not, it is there. And if we don't take action, we are going to be facing some very serious problems in the very near future.

So I am grateful to have a President who recognizes and acknowledges the energy emergency facing our Nation, and I look forward to working with him to unleash American energy production and achieve a secure, affordable, and reliable energy future with the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, over the last month, it has become clear how Donald Trump and Republicans govern. Donald Trump and Republicans have focused on things most Americans don't care about or don't like while refusing to focus on things Americans actually do care about.

Donald Trump and Republicans have focused on things most Americans don't care about or don't even like while refusing to focus on things Americans actually do care about.

Exhibit A of these things that Americans don't like is what is happening today in the House of Representatives. As soon as today, House Republicans will advance a budget resolution clearing the way for perhaps the most draconian cuts to Medicaid in American history, all so Republicans can cut taxes for their billionaires club and have the American people pick up the tab and pay the price. This is in the

category of things Americans really don't like.

There is only one proper way to describe the Republican plan that is moving through the House this week: radical. Radical. The Republican plan radically hurts American families while radically helping the billionaires club. Republicans are so eager to cut taxes for billionaires that they would increase the deficit by a trillion dollars or more to make room for their sweetheart-deal tax cuts for billionaires like Elon Musk.

Republicans are also pushing for trillions in cuts for working- and middle-class Americans, endangering everything from Medicaid to nutrition programs, to housing assistance, and so much more. The Republican bill could cut as much as \$880 billion from Medicaid alone. That means 80 million Americans—kids, veterans, people with disabilities, rural Americans, the elderly—are all at risk.

And why? Why are Republicans putting these people at such risk and hurting things that benefit them—not waste; things that actually go to people and help them? They are doing it to make life easier for the billionaires club. They are doing it to cut taxes for the ultrawealthy.

Last week, here in the Senate, during vote-arama, I pushed an amendment that said we should have no tax breaks for billionaires. I pushed an amendment calling for no billionaire tax breaks if even one dollar of Medicaid spending was cut. What is more important: helping people get healthcare, helping the elderly stay in nursing homes, helping our veterans—especially those who may be out of work—get the healthcare they need? What is more important—that or a tax break for someone who is very wealthy already?

Well, on both amendments—the one that said no tax breaks for billionaires and the one that said no tax breaks for billionaires if even one dollar of Medicaid spending was cut—both times, Republicans overwhelmingly said no.

Let us hope—let us hope—it may be a distant hope, but let us hope that House Republicans show more courage, more compassion, and more common sense to reject these horrible, harmful, radical cuts.

This is not what the American people signed up for in this election. Billionaire tax cuts is a clear example of things Americans don't like. Just look at all the backlash Republicans are seeing in their townhalls. And Republicans know this. Republicans know that cutting taxes for wealthy billionaires is something most Americans don't like at all. They didn't campaign on it. Oh, no. I didn't hear any of our Republican colleagues who were running go home and say "I want to cut taxes for the billionaires," although that is the first thing they are doing when they get here. Yet Republicans seem to be full steam ahead all the same.

This, of course, is part of the pattern I am talking about. Over the last month, Donald Trump and Republicans have spent their energy focused on things Americans don't like while refusing to focus on things Americans actually do care about—like inflation, rising prices.

We already see that Americans are upset with the Trump administration because prices continue to rise, as they have over the last many years. Donald Trump promised to bring down costs on day one. He said that the first day he is elected, he is going to start bringing costs down, but instead, inflation has gone up, grocery prices are up. Chicken, pork, steak—all more expensive. Eggs are up 15 percent from last month. All the while, Republicans are focused on things that Americans either don't like or don't care about.

Americans don't like, for instance, pardoning violent insurrectionists. It was one of the least popular things we have seen; a recent poll in the Washington Post is clear. But that was the first major decision Donald Trump made as President, the first major decision.

Most Americans don't care whether you call it the Gulf of Mexico or the Gulf of America or something else. Most Americans don't care about building hotels in Gaza or annexing Canada. Yet these are the things that Donald Trump is focused on to distract people from the fact that he doesn't actually have real solutions to the things Americans really worry about.

Of course, there are things that Republicans are focused on that make things actively worse. Most Americans don't think it is a great idea to get into a trade war with our closest allies. That is going to make trips to the grocery store even more expensive than they are now.

Of course, most Americans do care about making government more efficient. While everyone certainly supports cutting waste, Americans don't like the harmful chaos that Elon Musk and DOGE have unleashed. They don't want to see a rich billionaire treat Federal workers with immense disrespect. And make no mistake, Americans did not sign up for DOGE to endanger their Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid benefits. That is not government efficiency; that hurts the American people.

What DOGE is doing is chaos, and Americans know that the chaos being unleashed by DOGE is causing a lot of harm to the country. Americans don't want to see their air traffic safety personnel fired in droves, no questions asked. That is not government efficiency; that is chaos and danger at the airports and in airplanes, at security checkpoints.

Our veterans don't want to see the VA starved of resources. Someone came over to me the other day and said: My brother is in a VA hospital. He has a rare disease. Seven of the people were let go. Who is going to take care of him?

They don't want to hear about cuts to the Veterans Crisis Line, where veterans who may have come back from Iraq or Afghanistan with PTSD or other problems have a place to go and a place to call. That is not government efficiency, cutting the Veterans Crisis Line; that is just more chaos, more harm, more hurt. Can you imagine the callousness of firing personnel who operate the veterans suicide crisis line, as was reported by the staff at the VA? It is a cruel and vindictive way to treat America's heroes.

Of course, our 9/11 families did not sign up for DOGE trying to cut the 9/11 survivor health program—the people who rushed to the Towers, the brave heroes, police, fire, first responders, and others who rushed to the Towers in the days after that horrible day of 9/11 and got illnesses in their lungs and gastrointestinal tracts and now are getting some help. The 9/11 families didn't sign up to cut that, but that is precisely what DOGE tried to do. We pushed back, and I am glad that President Trump and DOGE reversed themselves on that issue. They should be reversing themselves on many other issues also that hurt people so badly.

But the takeaway is they are very clear: What DOGE is doing is not making government more efficient; it is creating more chaos. And if there is one thing Americans don't want in these turbulent times, it is more chaos.

Rather than actually cut waste in government in a smart way, a careful way, an efficient way; rather than putting the needs of working people first, Donald Trump, Elon Musk, and the Republican Party have plunged basic government services into chaos and taken a meat ax at programs that help workers, middle-class families, and low-income Americans, all for the sake of cutting taxes for billionaires and mega corporations.

Republicans are focused on the wrong things. They are helping the wrong people, and they are ignoring the vast majority of Americans they promised to serve.

Under Donald Trump's Republican Party, billionaires win, American families lose.

So let me say it once again. Over the last month, it has become clear how Donald Trump and Republicans govern. Donald Trump and Republicans have focused on things Americans don't care about or don't like while refusing to focus on things Americans actually do care about.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have just come to the floor, having listened to the minority leader, the

Democratic Senator from New York, say something to the effect that he thought that President Trump's policies were not popular with the American people.

As he was saying this, I recalled a poll, a Harvard-Harris poll, conducted just this past week. Trump's policies—the key thing why he won election as President of the United States—huge popularity of what the President is doing today: promises that he made prior to the election, promises kept now that he is in the White House.

Let's take a look at No. 1—deportation of illegal immigrants who have committed crimes. Mr. President, 81 percent of the American people—and that includes a lot of Democrats—say that is a very popular position taken by President Trump and now being enforced by President Trump.

Eliminating fraud and waste in government expenditures—76 percent of Americans agree. What have we seen happen with DOGE? What we have seen is actually pointing out fraud and waste in government. The American people are supportive.

Then, of course, closing the border. Again, 76 percent of Americans—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—all across the board support what President Trump is doing.

President Trump ran for office against a party that was a party of high prices and open borders, and it is because of those things that President Trump won and Republicans won the House and the Senate.

So now the minority leader comes to the floor and says that what President Trump is doing is not popular. Well, they sure are in terms of wasteful Washington spending and closing the border, which were the two reasons that President Trump and Republicans won the elections in November.

Let's talk about the things the American people care about. Republicans, President Trump—all of us promised to get America back on track. That is what we said we would do. That is what we are doing right now. We committed to cutting Washington's wasteful spending. We committed to reducing the size of a bloated government. This is going to make life more affordable for all Americans.

President Trump and Republicans are now doing exactly what we promised we would do. We are rooting out waste, we are rooting out fraud, and we are rooting out abuse by a bureaucracy, all across a bureaucracy. We are ripping it out root and stem.

The Department of Government Efficiency has already uncovered more than \$55 billion in savings. Who benefits from the savings? The American taxpayers.

U.S. taxpayers were spending \$2 million—take a look at this list—\$2 million to develop “sustainable recycling models” in the Balkans. Well, we have canceled that.

U.S. taxpayers were spending \$19 million on “biodiversity conversation” in Nepal. Well, that has been canceled.

U.S. taxpayers were spending \$47 million to improve “learning outcomes in Asia.” We canceled that.

U.S. taxpayers were spending \$1.5 million on “voter confidence” in Liberia, Africa. Well, we have canceled that.

U.S. taxpayers were spending \$21 million for voter turnout in India. Canceled.

More savings are on the way.

Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lee Zeldin, who we recently confirmed to that post, uncovered \$20 billion—with a “b”—\$20 billion in taxpayer money that the Biden EPA shoveled out the door on their last days before leaving office.

This was a slush fund, and it was funneled to eight leftwing climate groups. Now, all of this was in the service of the left's extreme, radical climate agenda—an agenda that makes energy more expensive and life less affordable for American families.

Who received these taxpayer-funded, undeserved gifts? Does anybody remember Georgia Democrat Governor candidate Stacey Abrams? Well, she was one of them. Her leftwing organization got a \$2 billion kickback from the Biden administration. I am so glad that Ambassador Zeldin caught this scam and is working to claw back the money for the taxpayers of this Nation.

I heard the minority leader admit just this morning—he said: Of course there is some wasteful spending. He didn't mention any of those things. He didn't actually point out what it is. But I don't hear him say what wasteful spending he wants to cut. In fact, I haven't heard any Democrats say what wasteful spending, if any, should be cut. What about that \$2 billion that was sent to Stacey Abrams?

Democrats added almost \$5 trillion to our debt in 4 years. Joe Biden and Democrats' reckless spending caused painfully high prices.

Cutting wasteful Washington spending is long overdue. President Trump and Republicans are uncovering massive evidence of wasteful Washington spending, and we are stopping it.

Democrats seem more upset that the waste they support is now being exposed than about the massive waste itself. Instead of defending the indefensible and the obscene level of spending, what are they doing? What do the Democrats do? They are demanding that the courts intervene. Hey, let's get the courts involved. This is the next chapter of destructive Democrat behavior.

Democrats have now filed over 80 lawsuits in 1 month against the Trump administration. Now, often, they go judge shopping. What are they looking for? They are looking for partisan, activist judges.

So how does that work? Well, last month—and it is unbelievable—last month, the State of New Jersey wanted to sue the administration, so they filed suit not in New Jersey but in Massachusetts. They sued in a district where

11 of the 13 district judges were appointed by Democrat Presidents. They didn't think they could accomplish what they wanted to accomplish in their own home State, so they go to Massachusetts, one of the most liberal States in the country. That is not a coincidence. It is intentional. It is premeditated. What is the aim of it? It is to obstruct President Trump's popular cost-cutting efforts.

Let me tell you how far the Democrats are taking this. Earlier this month, a Federal judge in New York issued a knee-jerk order that forbids political appointees from accessing records within the Treasury Department. The judge actually went so far as to block the Secretary of the Treasury, Scott Bessent, from accessing important data within the Agency that he runs, that he has been confirmed to serve as the Secretary of the Treasury by this very body, by the U.S. Senate, and you got a judge saying he doesn't have access to the Treasury records.

So a Federal judge blocks a Senate-confirmed Secretary of Treasury from getting the information he needs to run the U.S. Department of the Treasury. That is where the Democrats are headed.

District courts should not get to micromanage the executive branch. Yet that is what Democrats want to do with the courts, and that is why they have filed 80 lawsuits so far. It is not based on the law. It is not based on policy disagreements. This is based solely on political disagreements.

This is the real crisis we are facing in America. It is what I hear about in Wyoming. I heard about it this past weekend. It is unelected, unaccountable, heavyhanded Federal bureaucrats who have taken America off track. We are getting America back on track.

The American people are being strangled by Washington's wasteful spending, by burdensome redtape. According to a poll last month from the Associate Press, almost two in three Americans say government inefficiency is a major problem.

The bureaucracy must be accountable to the American people, and they are there to serve the American people. Americans voted in November for more accountability. They voted to drain the swamp. This is the swamp I am talking about, and that is exactly what President Trump is doing.

Working with President Trump, Senate Republicans are going to deliver on our mandate, and it is going to involve massive change in Washington because it is time, Mr. President, to get America back on track.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, did you see over the weekend Elon Musk, the richest man in the world, dancing on a stage with a chain saw? Did you see that? Most Americans did. That was his approach to DOGE government efficiency—take a chain saw to it, put an

Agency like USAID in the “wood chipper.” in his words. Does this sound like a thoughtful approach to making government more efficient or does this sound like a meat-ax approach from a man who has no business being there, an unelected individual who somehow has been given authority by this President to lop off tens of thousands of jobs day in day out?

Yes, we have gone to court. Many of the Agencies in the government—the employees and their representatives—have gone to court to question this ham-handed approach to making this government work, and they have been successful in the overwhelming percentage to receive temporary restraining orders and the like because on its face, serious questions are raised as to the authority of this President.

We have time-honored traditions when it comes to things like impoundment of Federal funds. The President cannot make that decision unilaterally. The power of the purse happens to be with the article I agency of the government, the legislature, not with the article II agency, the executive. As a consequence, when the President decides to do this unilaterally, he is being challenged in court, and he should be challenged in court.

This is not just a political issue, as one Senator just described; it is more importantly a constitutional issue and a legal issue, and it is going to be resolved ultimately by the court. Perhaps the President will win some of his cases and lose others. But this is a legitimate exercise of the authority in the Constitution.

I might add that this notion that we are going to start lopping off air traffic controllers and people who are responsible for aviation safety—I would just say to those who are for that and believe that is draining the swamp: Pay attention to what is happening across America. These terrible aviation disasters like the one that happened here in Washington, DC, should be taken seriously by us every day, and putting people in charge of these Departments who don't have adequate staff to monitor the flights of our Nation is active irresponsibility, as far as I am concerned.

The same thing is true with avian flu. Yes, the price of eggs is terrible. One of the reasons is avian flu is killing off the flocks of laying hens. As a consequence, we have fewer eggs and higher prices.

It is a very real concern because the avian flu is going to jump from these birds and fowl into the human chain, and we will face another pandemic. Do we want that? For God's sake, no. But the notion that we are going to lop off employees that are responsible for public health one after the other and somehow make this a safer nation is irresponsible on its face. Should it be challenged in court? Of course it should be, and I stand by that.

I just want to say to the Senator and others who make these comments: Think about what you are inviting

here, to give the President the authority this Congress has, the authority under the Constitution—to just give it away. Are we going to give away our responsibility under the Constitution because of the popularity of this President with some Members? I pray that we won't.

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 710 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON DRISCOLL NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Driscoll nomination?

Mr. MULLIN. 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 North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 90 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Banks	Grassley	Moran
Barrasso	Hagerty	Moreno
Bennet	Hassan	Mullin
Blackburn	Hawley	Murkowski
Boozman	Heinrich	Paul
Britt	Hickenlooper	Peters
Budd	Hoeven	Reed
Capito	Husted	Ricketts
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Collins	Johnson	Rosen
Cornyn	Justice	Rounds
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Schmitt
Cotton	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Curtis	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Daines	Lankford	Sheehy
Durbin	Lee	Sullivan
Ernst	Lummis	Thune
Fetterman	Marshall	Tillis
Fischer	McConnell	Warner
Gallego	McCormick	Wicker
Graham	Moody	Young

NAYS—28

Baldwin	Booker	Duckworth
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Gillibrand
Blunt Rochester	Coons	Hirono

Kim King	Ossoff	Warnock
Lujan	Padilla	Warren
Markey	Schultz	Welch
Merkley	Schiff	Whitehouse
Murphy	Schumer	Wyden
Murray	Slotkin	
	Smith	

NOT VOTING—6

Alsobrooks	Cruz	Tuberville
Cramer	Sanders	Van Hollen

The nomination was confirmed.

(Mr. CURTIS assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY be recognized for up to 15 minutes and, upon the use or yielding back of time, then make a motion to proceed to Calendar No. 15, S.J. Res. 11.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO JESS ANDREWS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise today for two reasons. No. 1, I am losing one of my best colleagues—she is sitting right here next to me—Ms. Jess Andrews. Jess has run my communications shop for—I don't know how many years—5 years.

I try to hire really good people, and, certainly, Jess is one of them. She is a very moral person. She is whip-smart. But when you hire good people, you know you are going to lose them because good people, capable people, like Jess, are ambitious people, and they want to move on to new positions.

Jess is becoming deputy chief of staff to our new Senator from Ohio. I wish her well, and I just wanted to thank her publicly.

Jess Andrews is the real deal, and she has just done an extraordinary job for the people in Louisiana and for the American people, and I am so, so grateful.

I congratulate our new Senator from Ohio. He is getting a good one.

So thank you, Jess.

S.J. RES. 11

Mr. President, the second reason I rise is to talk about a regulation that I am trying to get rid of, but I want to begin with this observation.

Nearly 5 years ago, when he was running for President—I remember it like it was yesterday—President Biden said:

I guarantee you, we are going to end fossil fuels.

“I guarantee you,” he said, in front of God, country, and the American people. “I guarantee you,” he said, “we are going to end fossil fuels.”

And he tried. For 4 years, he tried.

Here is why I point that out.

The first well drilled in the Gulf of America—I know some people call it the Gulf of Mexico. I don't want to get off into that discussion. But the first