

11 is outrageous; it is un-American; it is insulting to every 9/11 first responder, survivor, and family.

So, today, I sent a letter, with Senator GILLIBRAND, to Secretary Kennedy, urging him to immediately reverse the cuts that impacted the World Trade Center Health Program. Donald Trump, Secretary Kennedy, and DOGE have betrayed our sacred promise to never, never forget.

And what is the point of these cruel cuts? So Donald Trump and DOGE can give their billionaire buddies a tax break and have the 9/11 families pay the cost.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in 1938, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain touted the now-infamous Munich Agreement as a way to stave off Hitler's Nazi Germany. Prime Minister Chamberlain claimed it would "secure peace in our time." A year later, Hitler invaded Poland and triggered World War II, a devastating conflict that left Europe in ruins and millions dead and displaced.

Over time, Chamberlain's name became synonymous with the word "appeasement" for good reason. You see, while Chamberlain's goal of peace may have been honorable, he was dangerously naive about the human nature of a tyrant in Germany who was bent on territorial ambition, pursuits that could only be thwarted with a show of strength. Well, President Trump's "Art of the Deal" opening negotiation with Vladimir Putin has the same odor of appeasement.

Last week, Donald Trump announced he was ready to make a deal with Russian President Putin over Ukraine while, apparently, ignoring Ukraine's key demands for peace. In fact, Trump and his fledgling Defense Secretary publicly gave away huge concessions at the start, signaling they would not insist on a return to Ukraine's sovereign 2014 borders or future NATO membership. It is also not clear from the administration's bewildering Munich Security Conference's remarks if President Trump plans to even include Ukraine or our European allies in the negotiations for the future of Ukraine.

It is no wonder that, in the United Kingdom, where they remember Chamberlain's folly all too well, Donald Trump's early pronouncements were lambasted for their misreading of history by leaders across the political spectrum. Let me share some of the things that have been said by our ally United Kingdom about Trump's opening bid to end the war in Ukraine.

One member of Parliament lamented that the West now "might be facing the worst betrayal of a European ally since Poland in 1945."

And another said:

Surely, in Europe, we understand that no matter what we give Vladimir Putin, he is always going to want more.

And one final member of Parliament, in a refrain, I think, that best summarizes the situation, said:

[There] is less the Art of the Deal and more a charter for appeasement.

President Trump has always had a strange affinity for autocrats and dictators, a troubling character weakness for the leader of the free world to have. He almost seems to want their adoration and admiration, especially compared to the clear-eyed leadership of previous leaders even on the Republican side, like Ronald Reagan, who knew how to deal with the Soviets. But there are real consequences to Trump's autocratic liaisons for America and allied security, ones that Republicans in the Senate ought to take pretty seriously. His crazy rants about Greenland, Canada as the 51st State, Panama, and the so-called Gulf of Mexico may be amusing to some, including himself, but it certainly does not portend well for a foreign policy of the United States. Simply caving in to Putin and walking away from Ukraine—just as Chamberlain did to Hitler—is an invitation for more confrontations in the future.

Before I was elected to the House of Representatives in the 1970s, I was a guest of an organization known as the American Council of Young Political Leaders, ACYPL. They take young men and women who are aspiring to public office on trips to various parts of the world where you spend an extra amount of time to come to understand the situation. I was lucky. I had an opportunity to visit the Soviet Union in the worst Cold War atmosphere and environment—more than 2½ weeks in the Soviet Union moving from one city to the other and seeing what Soviet communism looked like.

During the course of that trip, we visited what was then the Soviet Republic of Lithuania. It had a personal appeal to me for family reasons. My mother was born in Lithuania and was an immigrant to the United States at the age of 2. I had never been there before, and I was shocked by what I saw. This once great country had become a vassal of the Soviet state, and the poor people there were struggling to maintain the most basic of freedoms. Lucky for me, a few years later, I was elected to Congress, serving first in the House and now in the Senate, and I have been able to see a dramatic rebirth of Lithuania.

Of course, at the end of the Soviet Union, they had their chance and fought for democracy. They gave lives and blood for that purpose, but it worked. They won their freedom, their independence.

Lithuania is not a big country with a big military budget. It is a small nation with a good military but certainly no match for anyone like Russia today. They have been concerned ever since that the day would come when Russia would reassert its ownership of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. So that is why they became members of NATO.

And what a celebration that brought on to realize, finally, that they were allies of the United States and had a NATO treaty to back them up, to protect them.

The same is true of Poland. Of course, Poland means a lot to Chicago and Illinois, and they are worried about the same fate: Now having won their independence, will they see it threatened by Russia in the future?

And so this decision by President Trump to reach out directly to Putin and negotiate is worrisome to me in many respects. First, what does it say if the NATO alliance, an alliance which used to bring together some of the greatest nations in the world to stand by their side one by one and protect the future of their country—President Trump is not even engaging the NATO alliance in this conversation about the future of Ukraine. In fact, he is hardly engaging Ukraine in this conversation.

I worry about where this is going to lead. I hope it leads to peace in Ukraine, the right kind of peace that we can count on. And I hope that the people of that country, who have shown such extraordinary courage with the support of the United States and NATO up until now, realize that we are still committed to the values that they value as well. That is in our future.

But I worry the opposite will occur, that President Trump will give in to Putin and his demands and Putin will then target the Baltics, Poland—and I don't know where—in his next assault on sovereignty. That is the reality of the moment.

NOMINATION OF KASHYAP PATEL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on a separate topic, later this week, Senate Republicans have scheduled a vote on the confirmation of Kash Patel, President Trump's nominee for FBI Director. It is a 10-year appointment, unusual by Senate standards, but it was designed to be 10 years so it would be depoliticized.

It is unfortunate that the Republicans are moving ahead despite the many problems with Mr. Patel's record. Mr. Patel has no experience—none—in administration and management, particularly of an organization like the FBI that has 38,000 agents in place—38,000. It is the premier criminal investigative Agency in our country, perhaps the world.

After meeting with Mr. Patel and reviewing his record and questioning him under oath at his hearing, I am deeply concerned about his fitness to serve as FBI Director. He has neither the experience, the judgment, nor the temperament to lead the FBI.

My Senate Republican colleagues, sadly, are willfully ignoring myriad red flags about Mr. Patel, especially his recurring instinct to threaten retribution against his political enemies and President Trump's perceived enemies. This is an extremely dangerous characteristic for someone who seeks to

lead the Nation's most powerful domestic investigative Agency for the next 10 years.

Mr. Patel, on day one, plans to—I quote him directly. He said this, now. On day one, as Director of the FBI, he plans to “shut down the FBI Hoover Building and reopen it the next day as a museum of the deep State.”

He even wrote a book on the subject that I punished myself by requiring that I read it from cover to cover to understand exactly what this man believed. He has peddled outrageous conspiracy theories that benefit President Trump, claiming that January 6, the assault on the Capitol, the insurrectionist assault, was “never an insurrection” and that the FBI—get this; this is Kash Patel—the FBI was “planning January 6 for a year.”

Where is this man coming up with these wild theories? And, incidentally, he compiled an enemies list and published it in the back of his book—60 names—“members of the . . . deep State,” which includes distinguished public servants from both political parties. Patel named former Attorneys General Bill Barr and Merrick Garland, former FBI Directors Robert Mueller and Chris Wray as the so-called members of the deep State, whatever that may be.

And he has even produced and sold recordings of a song—understand this for a moment: 1,600 people prosecuted for assaulting law enforcement officials here in this Capitol Building, who were working, as they are at this very moment, to keep us safe and our visitors safe.

What did Patel decide to do? He decided to assemble a choir of the January 6 individuals who were prosecuted. Then he was involved in making a recording of a patriotic song that these prisoners were singing, and then he was selling this recording and playing it at the rallies for President Trump.

I am not making this up, ladies and gentlemen. This is exactly what this man, who wants to head the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was doing and which he denied before our hearing under oath.

He has even produced these recordings and called the choir, the January 6 prisoners, political prisoners.

Let me take one example of a so-called political prisoner. Guy Reffitt was sentenced to 87 months in prison for his role in the January 6 assault on the Capitol. His 19-year-old son Jackson turned him in to law enforcement after the attack on the Capitol, despite Reffitt's threats to shoot his son and his son's sister if they reported him to authorities—a father threatening to kill his son and daughter if they turned him in.

After being pardoned, Guy Reffitt decided to come back to the Capitol and attend Kash Patel's confirmation hearing. He posted on social media afterward:

Present and in support of @Kash_Patel as the leftist commies continue to spew lies,

misinformation and disinformation. My man Klean House Kash.

This man, who brought a weapon into the Capitol, was prosecuted for that, serving time, given a complete pardon by President Trump, then comes back to the Capitol to attend the hearings and cheer on Kash Patel's nomination for Director of the FBI.

Before even being confirmed as FBI Director, Mr. Patel is already seeking retribution on behalf of President Trump, despite Patel's status as a private citizen. Multiple whistleblowers have disclosed highly credible information to my staff indicating that Mr. Patel has personally directed the ongoing purge of senior law enforcement officials at the FBI. Senior leaders with, collectively, hundreds of years of experience have been forced out at the FBI, creating a leadership vacuum.

Mr. President, this has never happened in the history of the United States and the history of the FBI, that a new President would come into office and decide to clean the ranks of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This has been an apolitical Agency. There is only one political appointee to the FBI: the Director. All the others are professionals who have been dedicating their lives to law enforcement for years.

Senior leaders who have shown their dedication to the United States are now being accused of suspect. Suspect for what? They were engaged in the investigation of the January 6 assault on the U.S. Capitol, an assault which I witnessed at this desk as I watched the Secret Service agents pull the Vice President from that chair and take him out of the Chamber as this mob assaulted the Capitol. It was real. In the FBI's long history, this has never happened before. Never.

Keep in mind: The Director, the only appointee of the FBI, and the leaders have been forced out despite their career commitment to law enforcement. This purge has dramatically weakened the FBI's ability to protect the country from national security threats, and it has made America less safe.

If these whistleblower allegations are true, that Kash Patel, as a private citizen, has been orchestrating the purging of the ranks at the FBI because of political loyalty questions, I will tell you that he came dangerously close to perjuring himself during his nomination hearing when asked about the possible firings of the FBI officials and he answered under oath “I don't know what's going on right now” at the FBI.

Mr. President, we are told that is not true; he was personally involved in it, despite the fact that he said the opposite under oath before our committee.

Mr. Patel has been open about his plans to dismantle the FBI and seek retribution against his and President Trump's enemies. His directives as a private citizen have already thrown the Bureau into absolute chaos.

Mr. Patel's recent actions and testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee confirm my belief that he

is dangerous, inexperienced, and he has been dishonest in portraying his role in what is happening at the FBI. It will be a political and national security disaster if he is confirmed.

And let me take it to a personal level. The FBI Agents Association came to me with this and talked about the very real personal and family concerns of dedicated FBI agents. They are fearful that an environment and climate has been created which puts their own safety in question.

Let me give you an example of another one of these 1,600 people who were prosecuted for the assault on the Capitol: Edward Kelley, convicted of assaulting law enforcement and other felony and misdemeanor offenses related to his conduct on January 6. The men and women who came in and were beating on the law enforcement officials who protect this Capitol, Kelley was one of them.

As I said, he was convicted, scheduled to be sentenced this April, until he was pardoned by President Trump last month. While awaiting trial on his January 6-related charges, Kelley was separately charged and convicted in his home State of Tennessee of conspiracy to murder law enforcement, including FBI agents and employees who participated in the investigation of his insurrectionist conduct.

Kelley's Tennessee murder conspiracy case remains pending sentencing, but Kelley argues that the case is related to his Washington, DC, charges and thus covered by President Trump's blanket pardon.

Kelley is a perfect example of the danger of publicly releasing the names of FBI agents who worked on January 6 cases, and there were some 5,000 employees of the FBI and the Department of Justice who were engaged in that. If we value these men and women who risk their lives every day for the safety of the United States, we cannot allow Kash Patel to become Director of that Agency, and we cannot run the risk that he will use their names publicly, as he has in his book, identifying his enemies list to the detriment of these agents and their families. We owe it to them to stand by them, as they have stood by us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the nomination of the President's nominee to run the Department of Commerce, an Agency that is charged with a broad mission and a lot of complex issues that affect many sectors of our economy.

The next Secretary of Commerce will have to deal with a wide-ranging, growing list of issues, from trade and export controls, expanding broadband, weather forecasting, patent issues, export controls on AI, and figuring out some of the most thorny issues related to how we move our country forward, generally, in commerce.

So it is fair to say that if the Commerce Secretary doesn't get it right, the American people and our American economy pay the price. Unfortunately, I believe that Howard Lutnick, the President's nominee, isn't the right person for this job at this point in time.

Now, Mr. Lutnick and the President have made it very clear that one of Mr. Lutnick's key responsibilities will be for trade policy and the tariff policies that the President supports.

In my conversations with Mr. Lutnick and before his Commerce Committee hearing, he made it very clear that he intends to be very enthusiastic about the President's plans for tariffs.

When he talked about tariffs, I don't know if he knew how much the U.S. economy was going to start paying the price. Talking to people throughout my State, I can tell you it is not lost on us, being a border State with Canada, how much this might affect us in oil and gas, in lumber, electric power, and many other issues of economic activity.

Mr. Lutnick was for, as the President said, the expanded taxes on imported steel and aluminum and across the board tariffs on China. As a result, China announced retaliatory tariffs, and other countries also promised to retaliate, too.

That is why, when the Seattle Times ran just recently this story about the tariffs, I really understood exactly how Washington businesses were feeling. That they know that one, this creates uncertainty, and they know that it raises costs.

Now, I come from one of the most trade dependent States in the Nation. That is because we grow a lot of agriculture products that go to overseas markets, we make airplanes that go to a lot of overseas markets, we have a lot of software and software development. So the majority of companies and the majority of employees in our State basically are involved in things related to making and growing U.S. products that are shipped to overseas markets.

My constituents want to see inflation come down, and they want us to lower costs, not increase them. Now that President Trump is teasing out even more tariffs in the coming days on autos, pharmaceuticals, and semiconductors, it is going to drive up costs for consumers.

Another newspaper in my State, the Spokesman-Review, hardly a liberal bastion in the State of Washington, also did a pretty big story about the trade and tariffs, and what they put in a headline: "Trump and Inflation."

I can tell you this, we can't afford inflation. We want prices to come down. Whether that is on housing or whether that is on pharmaceuticals or whether that is on food prices, we know that tariffs can increase prices.

So the Commerce Secretary, who is going to be involved in driving and responsible for this tariff impact, is not someone I want to see in this job. The

Secretary of Commerce's job is to expand exports. I think with 95 percent of consumers living outside the United States, it is time to try to reach a process where we can get more products into those markets.

I am also very concerned about how America maintains our competitiveness in an international marketplace if things are more expensive, particularly manufacturing. My State has been a great beneficiary of a renaissance in manufacturing for a whole lot of reasons, but because of the CHIPS and Science Act, the infrastructure bill, and the IRA bill. And all of those gave people a chance to bring supply chains back to the United States, start growing middle-class jobs in the United States of America again, and lowering costs.

That is why we worked so hard on the CHIPS and Science Act, something that was voted on here in a bipartisan fashion, led by then-Commerce Secretary Raimondo, in a process that ultimately awarded billions of dollars to advance the domestic semiconductor manufacturing industry here—in total, negotiating 32 deals across 22 States.

So I know that the Presiding Officer knows all about this as a member of the Commerce Committee, but there are many States that were the beneficiaries of these investments and are helping us bring even more of the domestic supply chain back to the United States.

We learned during the chips crisis that even the cost of a used car went up \$2,000. That is because chips were at a shortage, car industries, trucking industries couldn't even get enough chips to make and ship cars, and then the consequence was even used cars went up \$2,000.

So we don't want to recreate that again. We want a Commerce Secretary who is going to fight for the CHIPS and Science investment that has already been made in the electronic manufacturing process in the United States and keep the semiconductor industry right here.

But unfortunately, Mr. Lutnick, before the committee, would not commit to standing by the commitments of the term sheets the Department of Commerce has already signed.

In fact, before he has even been confirmed, Reuters last week said the administration started telling companies that they might even revisit these agreements that have been signed. So let me be clear, these are awards to critical States like Texas, New York, Ohio, Arizona, and Pennsylvania, and now, the President is saying he is going to revisit those signed contracts.

Delaying these projects also means we are delaying bringing the supply chain back to the United States, that we are making it harder for the United States to be competitive in an industry that is critical for us to lead, not just on the most advanced chips, but continuing in the manufacturing of semiconductors overall.

In his Commerce Committee nomination, Mr. Lutnick also heard from members of both sides of the aisle about their support for the science part of the CHIPS and Science Act. These are amazing initiatives that brought coalitions of people together to catalyze new economic engines, in some cases in the most rural parts of the United States. Why? Because it is so expensive to do innovation in Silicon Valley, in Boston, and even in some parts of my State.

So the whole point was to continue to make investments in test bedding and scaling technology, so the United States would not lose out. And these awards have been made, but Mr. Lutnick also refused to commit to honoring those agreements and putting many of those issues at question.

I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will continue to push for these investments. But today's nominee, if he is confirmed, is also going to be overseeing the Bureau of Industry and Security, which implements export controls and dual-use technology, and have both commercial and military proliferation applications.

That means you couldn't find a person whose day job is going to be more serious on export controls than Mr. Lutnick's. And yet, Mr. Lutnick, in the conversations that we had before the committee, I don't believe gave the committee a full understanding of what he was going to do to protect these interests.

In fact, the administration has already almost abandoned something called the AI Safety Institute, which is widely supported, literally by practicably everybody in the AI sector, and would help us remain a leader. This is the kind of standards that we would expect to be set and the kind of controls that we would hope would help the United States not have some vital technology exported outside the United States.

But we also questioned Mr. Lutnick on his background with stablecoin. Mr. Lutnick and the stablecoin that he has been involved in has been considered a very good tool for the cryptocurrency system, but a target of very illicit funds. Some estimates are that Tether accounts for as much as 60 percent of billions of dollars of illicit activities, by people like North Korea, Southeast Asia, Mexican fentanyl pushers, cybercriminals—and all because of stablecoin.

Now, Mr. Lutnick has an incredible personal story, losing his parents at a very young age and also the tragedy that befell Cantor Fitzgerald when terrorists struck.

So I know that Mr. Lutnick knows about terrorist organizations and has probably been affected for the rest of his life over that tragedy. But in the committee, when we were trying to get him to understand why we in the Federal Government put on sanctions against countries and we want to hear a Commerce Secretary say, "We agree

with those sanctions, we are going to fight for those sanctions, we are going to fight anybody who tries to get around those sanctions.”

We asked Mr. Lutnick about ways to address that fact that maybe some large amount, \$19 billion of Tether's funds, might be illegal, illicit transactions, he said he thought that in the future, a software AI solution would help stop that.

Well, I was hoping that Mr. Lutnick would be more aggressive than that. I would hope that he would help the United States in moving on something today that would help give more transparency in the cryptocurrency market. I support, as the Presiding Officer does, moving forward on cryptocurrencies. But I also believe that there should be some transparency and certainly should be a fight against people who use that for illicit activities.

I also asked Mr. Lutnick something about the U.S. sovereign debt futures, something that I know that he was involved in as it related to the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and putting up a competitive bid. It was a notion of, how do we settle futures? How do we in the United States—if Mr. Lutnick's future company was doing business with the London Exchange, settle any kind of—let's say we don't raise the debt ceiling and we had a crisis here, what would the United States do? Not unsimilar to what we did in 2009 after the 2008, basically, recession of our economy.

These similar questions came up in the Finance Committee, and I found that the Treasury nominee before the committee answered those questions correctly. But Mr. Lutnick said that he still thought that his idea of settling with a foreign country, which I think puts the United States second, above England, is not something I would be willing to do, but I think he was willing to continue to move forward.

So those things, an answer about how we will catch up with the money laundering in the future with an AI solution, and how the settling on the foreign exchange, also left me with some concerns. But when we come to NOAA, which is 60 percent of the Commerce budget, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, when asked for the record, “Should NOAA be dismantled, as called for in Project 2025?” Mr. Lutnick would only say he will figure it out once he is confirmed.

We needed a bigger commitment to NOAA. NOAA already supplies a big, important aspect of what we deal with, with weather forecasting, tracking extreme weather, hurricanes, wildfires, managing our fisheries, operating ships that conduct important charting for national security. Mr. Lutnick gave very tepid support for NOAA.

With 60 percent of the budget and so much now at stake, as the White House every day says they are going to cut staffing and cut programs, Congress wants to be assured that a nominee is going to fight for the Agency that he is

there to represent, that he is there to fight for their core mission that they provide in important services.

So I am urging my colleagues to not support this nominee and hope that we all can work together to continue to say how important NOAA's management of our fisheries are, how important it is to protect U.S. fishermen from Russian and Chinese illegal fishing and deception and trade practices that are hurting our consumers, and protect accurate weather forecasting for all Americans.

Now is our chance to stand up for these essential services; your constituents depend on it.

I thank the President and—oh, I would, just one more thing.

The aviation news that continues to roll out, I want to give my thoughts and prayers to those who have been affected by the Minneapolis to Canada flight for Delta Airlines.

We have now had the DCA incident and this incident and obviously one in Philadelphia. I would just say this: Now is not the time to cut FAA staffing. Now is the time to ask questions about what can we do to further enhance aviation safety. What can we all do, knowing that we have suffered from a door plug accident and from two MAX plane crashes.

And while we passed legislation to address those MAX crashes, we still have work to do. And we passed an FAA 5-year reauthorization that helped us get more air traffic controllers.

It is critically clear to me that we need these air traffic controllers, and so we have to make these investments. We should be working together, right now, on aviation. The most important thing? Let's work together for the benefit of the flying public to come up with the best solutions that we can implement in aviation safety.

Taking a broad brush and just cutting people out of the FAA, when oftentimes they are the people that are helping you get that safety, is not what we should be doing right now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam 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 KASHYAP PATEL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today, we are going to take a procedural vote on Kash Patel's nomination to be Director of the FBI. I want to take a few minutes to express my support for his nomination and to urge my Democratic colleagues to consider voting for this nomination.

Mr. Patel's resume doesn't look like a normal one for an FBI Director, but

everybody knows in this Congress and maybe in the United States that we are not living in normal times. As I have exposed through my oversight work, the FBI has been infected by politicalization, and this storied Agency has been weaponized against political opponents.

Mr. Patel is the right man at the right time. His career has been a study in fighting for unpopular but righteous causes, exposing corruption, and putting America first. Mr. Patel has served as a public defender, a counterterrorism prosecutor under President Obama, and a House staffer.

In the House, he worked to expose Crossfire Hurricane as a political hit job that was based on discredited information paid for—would you believe it?—by the Democratic National Committee and the Clinton campaign.

After exposing the Russiagate scandal in Congress, Mr. Patel then went on to serve as Senior Director of Counterterrorism at the National Security Council, Deputy Director of National Intelligence, and Chief of Staff to the Acting Secretary of Defense.

He has fought for transparency and accountability in government. I have fought for this in Congress for decades. That is the right approach because everybody knows that more transparency in government brings accountability by those of us serving in the government. In other words, the public business should be public.

Because of his efforts in exposing corruption, Mr. Patel has been relentlessly attacked, as we have seen over the last 2 months. These smears began long before his confirmation hearing. I understand why he has been targeted in this way. He exposed a threat to the existing system—a system that has retaliated against whistleblowers, engaged in unprecedented lawfare against the President and the American people, and obstructed congressional oversight. Mr. Patel will end these abuses. He will restore the FBI to its essential mission of keeping Americans safe.

Mr. Patel's vision for a new FBI is why he has been endorsed by organizations representing more than 680,000 law enforcement officers and by dozens of former and current FBI agents, State attorneys general, and U.S. attorneys. They trust Mr. Patel, and we should as well.

I urge all of my colleagues to support Mr. Patel's nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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