

NOAA works to protect our fishing industry and bring American seafood to kitchen tables around the world, supporting 1.7 million fishing jobs, a quarter of a trillion dollars in seafood industry sales, and \$117 billion in value-added impacts.

And the list goes on and on and on.

A study by the American Meteorological Society found that every dollar invested in the National Weather Service produces \$73 in value to the American people.

NOAA isn't a creature of Washington, DC. It is in Norman, OK, where NOAA's Storm Prediction Center tracks severe weather and tornado warnings. It is in Florida, where NOAA's National Hurricane Center monitors incoming storms to save lives and mitigate property loss. It is in Alaska, where scientists at NOAA's Fisheries Science Center work to maintain healthy fish populations to support local fishermen.

It is in my home State of Rhode Island, the Ocean State, where NOAA is building Atlantic Marine Operations Center, which will centralize its operations and take advantage of the expertise found in Rhode Island and our nearby States.

We have an incredible concentration of oceanographic and marine scientists.

We have the Naval Undersea Warfare Center in Newport. They are leaders in research for undersea vessels, issues that are critical to our national security. The University of Rhode Island, just across the bay, has a nationally recognized School of Oceanography, and they have just devoted millions of dollars to upgrade and improve that. They will receive a new research vessel shortly.

We have a partnership with Woods Hole in Massachusetts, just probably 45 minutes away. This is where the scientific center on oceanography is gradually emerging, and so NOAA's arrival will be beneficial. But it won't be a result simply of their efforts; it will be the combination of what we have already put in place.

NOAA is, as I said, situated in an area where—the Blue Economy, which includes our Graduate School of Oceanography at the University of Rhode Island, the Naval Undersea Warfare Center, small shipyards, and one of the most important fishing ports on the east coast. They will become an integral part of that. So they will be sustained and supported at the same time they sustain and support our current efforts.

As we face new and ever-growing challenges, including those driven by climate change and extreme weather, NOAA's work is more vital than ever.

The President and Mr. Musk's reckless threats to NOAA's workforce, its budget, and its scientific research will make us less prepared and cost more money and, indeed, lives.

Craig McLean, who served as NOAA's top scientist during the first Trump administration, said of the threats posed by the President and Elon Musk:

It's dire. . . . The way that this is being handled is with ignorance and a sledgehammer rather than the appropriate discretion that's necessary.

Protecting NOAA and its workforce is an investment in our future, an investment in our ability to predict and prepare for natural disasters and in the resilience of our planet.

I urge the President and my colleagues to protect NOAA and ensure it can continue to carry out its mission and continue to provide valuable services to the American people.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TERMINATING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED WITH RESPECT TO ENERGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 10, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, which the clerk will report by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 10) terminating the national emergency declared with respect to energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be six hours for debate only, with the time equally divided between the leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Texas.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know there is a lot going on in Washington, DC, these days given the speed and the aggressiveness with which President Trump and his administration have attacked his agenda, and I use that in a very positive way. It gets a little confusing to figure out what is important and what is maybe not quite so important.

But I would like to talk about one thing that has been very top of mind for a lot of us here in the House and the Senate; and that, of course, is the process to implement President Trump's "America First" agenda.

This is what the election was about, just on November 5. And, of course, a lot of ink has been spilled on the mechanics of the process, talking about budget resolutions, reconciliation instructions, and things that are gibberish to most Americans, but this is the process by which we do the job of implementing President Trump's "America-First" agenda.

Last week, my Senate colleagues and I were here late into the night and into the early morning voting on amend-

ments to the budget passed out of the Senate Budget Committee on which I serve.

Our colleagues in the House voted to pass their version last night, so now we find ourselves at a critical juncture with a different budget resolution in the House from that passed by the Senate.

And, of course, as I said, we have been spending a lot of time and energy talking about procedural questions up to this point. Questions over whether the Republicans will enact President Trump's agenda in one bill or two, whether the bill that eventually reaches the President's desk would originate in the House or the Senate. A great deal of discussion and debate has been ongoing about all of these details and more.

But what is most important is to keep our eye on the prize, what we are actually trying to accomplish. As I mentioned at the beginning, last November, millions of Americans went to the polls and elected President Trump and to turn the page on the last 4 years of the Biden administration's disastrous inflationary policies.

We finally reached a point where, as Admiral Mullen, the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff about 10 years ago, when asked what our biggest threat to our national security was, he said it was the debt. And at the time, I think many of us, me included, thought, well, that is kind of an interesting take. Well, we have finally come to a point where Admiral Mullen's statement and reality have converged, where we are now paying more interest on the national debt than we are on defense of our Nation, in a dangerous world which seems to be getting more dangerous all the time.

We spend about 2.8 percent of our gross domestic product on national defense, and there is no question in my mind that we are going to have to up that figure substantially, but we can't do it by continuing to borrow against our Nation's credit card and to crowd out other investment and to pass that debt on to our children and grandchildren. That is just flat immoral.

So now the task at hand is to enact the policies that the American people voted for. And what are those policies? Well, first and foremost, we have to secure the southern border. I represent a State of about 31 million people with a 1,200-mile common border between the United States and Mexico.

We know in Texas what the price that we have had to pay—not just at the border, not just in Texas, but throughout the Nation—for the open border policies of the Biden administration. Customs and Border Protection encounters with illegal migrants increased more than 40 percent from fiscal year 2021 to fiscal 2023, totaling more than 10 billion encounters nationwide.

And when we say this is an encounter, this is people showing up, claiming asylum, only to be released into the interior of the United States and given a

court date that may be 10 years off or simply paroled, which means released into the United States, given a work permit. In other words, in the words of the Border Patrol when I asked them, what do you think the best solution is to deal with this flood of humanity coming across the border, they used one word. They said “consequences.” There have to be consequences to coming to the United States outside of legal immigration channels.

And during the Biden administration, there simply were no consequences. It was like having a big, green traffic light on the border telling people from anywhere around the world: Come on in.

And, of course, the people who facilitated that are these criminal organizations, the cartels that have now been designated as foreign terrorist organizations by the Trump administration. And, oh, by the way, not only did they traffic in human beings for all sorts of purposes—including human trafficking of children, young girls, young boys—these were the same people who facilitated the movement of drugs across the border in massive quantities that took the life of more than 100,000 Americans last year alone. About 70,000 of those were from fentanyl, a word that has become more common lately because it is ubiquitous; it is everywhere. It is in States like Montana, States like Texas. And many of my colleagues have said: Well, as a result of the disastrous border policies of the Biden administration, every State is now a border State.

Well, on top of all the people who were simply released—basically enriching the cartels, who charge by the head, and making it easier for them to smuggle drugs into the United States—more than 1.7 million “got-aways” evaded Border Patrol. What that means, basically, is they were seen on a camera or some sort of sensor, but by the time the Border Patrol showed up, they were gone.

And, of course, these are the people who, frankly, are up to no good. Whether they have criminal records, whether they were carrying drugs, whether they had some other reason to evade law enforcement, these are not honest, hard-working people who just simply wanted a better way of life—1.7 million “got-aways.”

The human and drug trafficking facilitated by the Biden administration’s open border policies have caused immeasurable suffering to the people of Texas and the people of the Nation. The fentanyl manufactured with Chinese precursors smuggled through the open borders has taken tens of thousands of American lives. It is a shocking statistic to me that, out of the 70,000 or so—young people, mainly—who died as a result of ingesting fentanyl, unbeknownst to them, they thought they were actually consuming something else—a Percocet, some other relatively innocuous drug—only to find out the hard way that it was contami-

nated with fentanyl, a deadly drug, which is now the leading cause of death for young people between the ages of 18 and 45.

We know where it comes from. The chemicals come from China. We know where it goes to be manufactured and made to look like relatively innocuous pills that are then taken by our young people. It comes across the border from Mexico. And yet the Biden administration’s open border policies made it easier, not harder, for that to happen, and the results, as I said, have been disastrous.

Well, now it is up to us to right the ship by enacting President Trump’s border security agenda, but we also have other work to do. We have to extend the expiring tax provisions of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, a bill that we passed in 2017. And after 5 years, many provisions of that tax bill expire.

If Congress fails to extend the tax cuts championed by President Trump in his first term and passed by Republican majorities in the House and Senate, Americans will face the highest tax increase in recent history. A family of four making around \$80,000 a year will see a \$1,700 a year tax hike if these provisions expire.

Let me say that again: A family of four making \$80,000 a year will see a tax increase of \$1,700 next year if these provisions expire.

Now, the reason why I emphasize that is because to listen to our Democratic colleagues, you would think it is all about billionaires and millionaires. But, no, 62 percent of American taxpayers would pay more taxes if we experience a multitrillion-dollar tax increase as a result of the expiration of these provisions in 2025.

Well, after 4 years of the highest inflation we have had in the last 40 years, families have struggled to keep up. In fact, many of them have been stuck with an effective pay cut and a reduction in their standard of living because the same dollars in their pocket have had less purchasing power than they used to, as a result of this insidious, secret, or invisible tax known as inflation.

So now is not the time to slap these American families with a tax increase. That would be insult to injury. After Washington Democrats eroded the purchasing power of American families, it would only add insult to injury to go back to those same families in Texas and elsewhere and insist that the government needs to take even more of their hard-earned paycheck come tax day.

I was proud to work with President Trump in 2017, along with all of my colleagues. I happened to be the chief vote counter back then, as majority whip, when we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and made sure that it had the necessary support to get across the finish line. It wasn’t easy, but it was important. And it had a huge impact on the quality of life and the standard of living of millions and millions of Americans.

And so I look forward to working with my colleagues here in the Senate to extend those expiring provisions, now during President Trump’s second term.

Last but not least, we have to begin the process of getting our spending and debt under control in order to get a grip on the historic, runaway inflation caused by President Biden and Washington Democrats’ reckless spending spree, and I also mentioned the impact it has on our ability to provide for the common defense and our national security. Ronald Reagan famously said: Peace—which is something we all aspire to—peace comes through strength. Weakness is a provocation and an invitation to the world’s tyrants and bullies—people like Vladimir Putin, people like President Xi in China. If they sense weakness, they will take advantage of it. And what we would need to do in America and with our allies is to reestablish deterrence. That is what “peace through strength” means, and we can’t do it by continuing to spend borrowed money and racking up debt on our Nation’s credit card.

We have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to address not only discretionary spending—which is what we do on an annual basis, which is about 28 percent of what the Federal Government spends—but mandatory spending. The Federal Government spends an enormous amount of money each year. It is in excess of \$6.5 trillion.

Now, I don’t have the brain capacity to conceive of what \$6.5 trillion is, and I doubt anybody does. But it is a lot of money, and there is no way we are going to be able to get our spending problem and our debt problem under control by addressing 28 percent of what the Federal Government spends.

So we need to look not only at the discretionary spending; we need to look at the so-called mandatory spending, which is on auto pilot. And, yes, Medicare and Social Security are off the table. We are not going to be talking about those. We need to address those at some point, but we can only do that with bipartisan support.

And then there are things like the Tax Code, which is more than just deductions and credits. Our Democratic colleagues have now turned the Tax Code into a welfare benefit scheme. The child tax credit and the earned income tax credit are refundable tax credits, which means it is not a credit against income. It is not a deduction. It is a check that is handed out. And there are \$200 billion worth of refundable tax credits paid out on an annual basis by the Federal Government—\$200 billion. We need to get ahold of that. We need to get that under control.

We also need to return to common-sense requirements that were bipartisan back in the days of Bill Clinton, which is meaningful work requirements for means-tested programs. We need to help people who need help. But if people are able to help themselves by working and providing for their family

and they don't need to be a burden on the taxpayers, then they should be contributing like everybody else and not living off of the American taxpayer.

Americans across the country voted to end the reckless policies of the Biden administration. So now it is up to us to deliver. We have kicked the can down the road so far, we have run out of road, and now we have a once-in-a-generation opportunity, with President Trump and Republican majorities in both Houses, to do something about it.

The House and the Senate have the same goal. The American people have given this administration a mandate, and the clock is ticking. At the end of the day, what matters is not whether the talking heads in the media or people across the country see this as a Senate bill or a House bill. That is inconsequential. What matters is that it is President Trump's agenda that we are implementing, as mandated by the American people last November 5.

We need to get this across the finish line to secure the border, to provide for the common defense, to avoid a massive tax increase on middle-class families, and to get our national debt under control once and for all. That is what Texans voted for on November 5, and I believe that is what Americans voted for on November 5. That is our mandate, and we have no option but to get this job done.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF JAMIESON GREER

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Jamieson Greer to serve as U.S. Trade Representative. If confirmed, he would be the top official on one of the President's signature issues: trade and tariffs.

Donald Trump was elected President largely on the promise of lowering prices for American families and remaking the global economy to America's benefit. Six weeks into his Presidency, what he has shown is a willingness to impose staggering costs on our families, workers, and businesses in order to settle scores on issues that have nothing to do with trade or the economy. He gets headlines; his wealthy friends get tax breaks; and American families get stuck with higher prices and bigger bills.

I oppose this nomination. I certainly have nothing against Mr. Greer personally. I just believe, in this position, he will be a rubberstamp for the Trump tax, the knee-jerk decision to slap tariffs on nearly everything Americans buy, and make high prices even higher. Mr. Greer has embraced the Trump

chaos strategy, which is a slap in the face to farmers, manufacturers, and communities across the country. They are sounding the alarm about how the Trump program is already costing them sales overseas and jobs here at home. Our country needs a U.S. Trade Representative who will be the point person on trade for this administration, and I just don't have the confidence in Mr. Greer for that job.

Let me start with the first key point. The Trump administration's across-the-board tariffs are going to cost Americans big time—up to \$2,600 a year, according to one estimate. That could devastate American jobs. One appraisal is that they could destroy 344,000 American jobs.

Donald Trump has already ordered tariffs on Canada, Mexico, and China. The China tariffs went into effect last month. Now, he is promising that 25 percent tariffs on everything Americans buy from Mexico and Canada will go into effect next week. Get ready for gas prices to go up, power prices to spike, auto supply chains to be thrown out of whack, and fresh fruits and vegetables to get more expensive.

And there is more. Donald Trump has promised new tariffs on steel and aluminum, which go into everything from soda cans to cars. Yesterday, he proposed tariffs on copper, which is used in everything from housing to medical devices and cars. They largely come from Chile and Canada. And he is pushing something called reciprocal tariffs on . . . maybe . . . everything.

The only thing we can be sure about with Trump's tariffs is that they are going to hit working Americans the hardest. Donald Trump, Elon Musk, and their billionaire friends are barely going to notice the price hikes.

If you ask people at a Fred Meyer's store in Gresham, OR, or who are buying groceries in Charlotte or in Kalamazoo, they don't need an economist to know that Donald Trump isn't helping prices. Less than a third of Americans approve of the job Donald Trump is doing on inflation, according to a poll released this week. Consumer sentiment—a particularly important measure—fell by 10 percent this month. More and more Americans are rightly worried that tariffs are going to drive more inflation.

If this trade war continues, there is no doubt many U.S. workers, farmers, and ranchers are going to lose their jobs when our trading partners retaliate and slap tariffs on "Made in the USA" products. That is what happened the last time Donald Trump was in office. American producers of everything from rice to bourbon to motorcycles got hammered. They sold less overseas, made less money, and workers ended up paying the price.

There is a right way to approach tariffs that punishes bad actors like China and targets the products that will change other countries' behaviors while minimizing the cost to American families. Donald Trump is doing the

opposite. He is maximizing price spikes for regular Americans, with no plan or strategy.

One other point with respect to trade chaos: Mr. Greer has endorsed this, and it is already hurting farmers and small businesses. Now, I had four townhall meetings in my State recently and talked with lots of small businesses and farmers.

I am hearing one message over and over again: They are already losing sales and losing markets to Donald Trump's bluster. Last year, our State exported \$34 billion in blueberries, hazelnuts, and other goods overseas—almost an alltime high. Now, instead of building on that success, our producers and innovators prepare for the worst.

This story comes up again and again. The Washington Post quoted an Iowa farmer who has seen prices of seed, fertilizers, and equipment increase while prices for soybeans are flat. "Our goal is to make Iowa and U.S. soybean farms profitable," said this Iowa farmer, "and to do that, we need these international markets. We need to keep growing demand."

The State economist in Georgia said this month that the greatest threat to that State's economy—and I will repeat that—the greatest threat to the economy is Trump's trade threats. Tariffs mean higher prices for consumers while trade wars mean other countries buy less of what Georgia makes, including aerospace components, pulp and paper, and auto parts.

Pittsburgh-based aluminum manufacturer Alcoa said Trump's tariffs will cost 100,000 jobs in the United States and won't lead to more production here. "This is bad for the aluminum industry in the [United States]. It's bad for American workers"—not according to some Member of the Senate, but that is what the Alcoa CEO said. There are similar reports of communities fearing the worst in Wisconsin, North Carolina, and all across America.

One final reason I oppose the Greer nomination: It is not clear to me that he will be the final voice in the room with Donald Trump on trade. There are an awful lot of trade cooks in that kitchen. Peter Navarro, Treasury Secretary Bessent, and Commerce Secretary Lutnick all have claimed responsibility for trade. It reminds me of an old saying that gets attributed to John Madden:

If you've got two quarterbacks, you have none.

Well, if you have four chief trade officials, you have none.

Unfortunately, Mr. Greer did little in his confirmation process to build confidence that the buck stops with him on trade. He said it is not a trade matter when Donald Trump uses tariffs to settle scores about the border, immigration, and diplomatic issues. So Mr. Greer said these decisions aren't something he would expect to be involved with if confirmed. If the U.S. Trade Representative isn't going to be in the room when tariff decisions are at

stake, it is not clear to me what influence over critical trade decisions Mr. Greer will have in the Trump administration.

Americans need a trade policy that puts workers and families first and a chief trade official who has the authority to deliver actual results for our workers and families. Unfortunately, neither of those is on offer today. That is why I oppose this nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Jamieson Greer, who is nominated to serve as the U.S. Trade Representative.

I think I ought to just probably set a couple of facts straight about President Trump's utilization of the various policies that he used in the past term when he was President the first time.

It was said that wages went down, prices went up, and that people are going to face terrible, dire consequences if he is able to follow his trade policies again in this term. The reality is that under President Trump, wages went up, jobs went up, unemployment went down, benefits went up, the economy grew dramatically, and we had the strongest economy in our lifetimes because of the policies President Trump pursued. So I don't think people should let the politics of fear—saying that everything President Trump does is going to hurt people—convince them otherwise.

The Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, which was created in 1962 by Congress, develops and coordinates U.S. international trade policy and oversees trade negotiations with other countries.

The U.S. Trade Representative—the role for which Mr. Greer is nominated—historically and statutorily serves as the United States' principal adviser, negotiator, and spokesperson on trade issues. Mr. Greer is well suited for these roles, as demonstrated during his previous tenure as USTR Chief of Staff when he worked with both sides of the aisle in negotiating and securing congressional approval of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, which passed the Senate 89 to 10.

I would note that the previous U.S. Trade Representative, who is now being replaced by Mr. Greer, and President Biden himself for the past 4 years refused to actually negotiate any bilateral trade agreements with other nations—none.

Throughout the nomination process, Mr. Greer demonstrated his strong commitment to working with Congress in a bipartisan fashion to advance the interests of our farmers, ranchers, fishers, and workers. In particular, I applaud Mr. Greer's commitment to change that pattern of the last 4 years and to negotiate and work on opening markets for our farmers and manufacturers around the globe, negotiating new bilateral trade agreements and en-

forcing existing ones—something we have not seen for 4 years.

I fully welcome a return to the USTR that performs its statutory obligation of creating new opportunities for Americans, and I look forward to the USTR's forthcoming reviews of foreign trade barriers that stymie U.S. investments and imports.

I urge my colleagues to join me now in advancing Mr. Greer's nomination. It is critical that the United States have a USTR at the helm of these investigations and to support the administration's return to an active and robust trade agenda that prioritizes America's farmers, ranchers, workers, and businesses.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jamieson Greer, of Maryland, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

VOTE ON GREER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Greer nomination?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Banks	Fischer	McCormick
Barrasso	Graham	Moody
Blackburn	Grassley	Moran
Boozman	Hagerty	Moreno
Britt	Hawley	Mullin
Budd	Hickenlooper	Murkowski
Capito	Hoeven	Peters
Cassidy	Husted	Ricketts
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cornyn	Johnson	Rounds
Cotton	Justice	Schmitt
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Curtis	Lee	Sheehy
Daines	Lummis	Slotkin
Ernst	Marshall	Sullivan
Fetterman	McConnell	

Thune	Tuberville	Wicker
Tillis	Whitehouse	Young

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—1

Cramer

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TERMINATING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED WITH RESPECT TO ENERGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Virginia.

S.J. RES. 10

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to begin a discussion that will take place, during today, about S.J. Res. 10, which is a resolution that my colleague Senator HEINRICH and I have filed to challenge President Trump's day-one declaration of a U.S. energy emergency.

And you will hear from a number of our colleagues today, expressing the basic point that the declaration is a sham. There is, in fact, no emergency, but it has been declared so as to gut various environmental laws passed by Congress, still part of U.S. statutory law, in order to advantage certain kinds of energy—i.e., oil, gas, and coal—and punish other forms of energy—wind, solar, et cetera.

I am very, very happy to have the support of my colleague Senator HEINRICH, who is the energy expert on the Democratic side in this body, and very, very happy to have so many colleagues who will be speaking on this matter today on the Senate floor.

President Trump took a number of actions on his first day in office, and many of them got a lot of attention. One that didn't get so much attention was his decision, on day one—on day one—to declare that the United States was in an energy emergency and, therefore, we needed to bypass environmental laws.

I want to dig into the sham nature of the emergency declaration and then explore why President Trump actually has done this, and, finally, conclude with a request to my colleagues that the article I branch should not just roll over and play dead when a President