

Mr. Sauer's nomination is a danger to the rule of law. At his confirmation hearing, I asked him a very simple question that any first-year law student should be able to answer, let alone a nominee seeking Senate confirmation.

When I asked him whether an elected official should be allowed to defy a Federal court order, Mr. Sauer said, "Generally, if there's a direct court order that binds a federal or state official, they should follow it."

I was appalled that someone seeking to become the "Tenth Justice," as the Solicitor General is commonly known, would take such a position.

As my colleague Senator KENNEDY warned Mr. Sauer and another Justice Department nominee who also refused to commit to following court orders "Don't ever, ever, take the position that you're not going to follow the order of a federal court. Ever."

But that is not my only concern with Mr. Sauer. Both he and Ms. Dhillon are part of the growing list of the President's personal lawyers who have been nominated for senior DOJ roles.

Ms. Dhillon and her law firm have represented the President as an individual and his campaigns on numerous occasions, pocketing more than \$8 million in legal fees.

And Mr. Sauer recently filed an amicus brief in the U.S. Supreme Court on behalf of the President, urging the Court to stay the effective date of the law that bans TikTok.

During his hearing, Mr. Sauer repeatedly refused to commit to recusing himself from matters connected to his representation of President Trump, including a current case appealing the \$364 million judgment entered against the President in New York.

Instead, Mr. Sauer only offered to consult with "the appropriate Department of Justice ethics officials." This gives me little reassurance since the administration recently forced out the Justice Department's senior apolitical career ethics officials.

And Ms. Dhillon's loyalty to the President goes beyond a typical attorney-client relationship. She has repeatedly questioned the legitimacy of the 2020 Presidential election.

In November 2020, she tweeted, "STOP THE STEAL!" and encouraged her followers to donate to President Trump's so-called election defense fund.

During her hearing, Ms. Dhillon doubled down on her election denialism, repeating her dubious claims about supposed irregularities and so-called "voter integrity." And she refused to admit that President Biden won the 2020 election.

Ms. Dhillon also has a long history of seeking to restrict civil rights, which is deeply concerning. She has criticized key provisions of the Voting Rights Act and supported laws that make it harder to vote.

And she has an extensive history of hostility toward the LGBTQ+ commu-

nity, especially transgender Americans.

It is the duty of the head of the Civil Rights Division to protect the civil rights of every American. I cannot and will not support a nominee whose record suggests she is more likely to attack civil rights than defend them.

And it is the Solicitor General's duty to represent the U.S. Government before the Supreme Court. I do not believe Mr. Sauer will put the American people's interests above President Trump's.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing these nominees.

#### VOTE ON SAUER NOMINATION

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

Mr. PETERS. 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 163 Ex.]

##### YEAS—52

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

##### NAYS—45

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

##### NOT VOTING—3

Crapo	Murray	Shaheen
-------	--------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). 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.

#### WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Oz nomination.

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 53, Mehmet Oz, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, John R. Curtis, Joni Ernst, Mike Crapo, Bill Hagerty, Tommy Tuberville, Roger Marshall, John Boozman, Ron Johnson, Rick Scott of Florida, Steve Daines, Tom Cotton, Todd Young, Mike Rounds, Ted Budd, Pete Ricketts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Mehmet Oz, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 164 Ex.]

##### YEAS—50

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

Sheehy	Thune	Wicker
Sullivan	Tuberville	Young

## NAYS—45

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

## NOT VOTING—5

Boozman	Murray	Tillis
Hoeven	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 45.

The motion is agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant executive clerk read the nomination of Mehmet Oz, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

## RUSSIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, anyone here remember how Donald Trump promised to end Russia's war on Ukraine in 1 day if he was elected? That is right: 1 day. Well, we are 73 days into his term, with Russia still raining death and destruction upon the people of Ukraine. Instead of ending the war, Donald Trump has alienated and bullied our allies around the world—our allies.

He insulted and blackmailed Ukrainian President Zelenskyy, who has led Ukrainians fighting bravely for more than 3 years, and 46,000 Ukrainians have died in defense of their country. He has decimated low-cost soft power by gutting USAID and Voice of America, giving away our influence and leadership to China and Russia—a move the head of Russian state TV called—get this quote—“an awesome decision by Trump! We couldn't shut them down, unfortunately, but America did so itself.”

By turning our backs on the rest of the world, Donald Trump is undermining the promise of America as a beacon of democracy, freedom, and human rights. All the while, Russian President Putin is laughing at us, watching with glee as America destroys its own leadership and credibility—something he could only have dreamed of in his former KGB days.

If you don't believe me, read New York Times columnist Tom Friedman. His recent column's title tells the story: “I Don't Believe a Single Word Trump and Putin Say About Ukraine.”

Washington Post columnist Max Boot wrote “Putin is playing Trump and Witkoff like a Stradivarius,” ask-

ing dismayingly what the rest of us are pondering as well: “Does Trump seriously believe Putin is negotiating in good faith to end the war in Ukraine?”

Or listen to the senior Republican Senator from Kentucky. Here is what he said:

Unless we change course, the outcome we're heading for today is one we can least afford: a headline that reads “Russia wins, America loses”. . . . An illusory peace that shreds America's credibility, leaves Ukraine under threat, weakens our alliances, and emboldens our enemies.

I agree.

Consider the last few months of negotiations between Trump and Putin that led almost nowhere and emboldened Russia. The supposed cease-fire was supposed to narrowly limit Russian attacks, and here we have them bombing hospitals.

A supposed deal to stop fighting in the Black Sea was a giveaway to the Russians that undermined the Ukrainians.

Or consider President Trump's special peace envoy Steve Witkoff, a real estate tycoon from New York who is in competition with Neville Chamberlain for the world's most naive appeaser. Witkoff recently told another Putin apologist, Tucker Carlson, that he liked Putin and didn't regard him as a bad guy.

The same Witkoff groveled over Putin's obviously manipulative portrait gift to Trump, and he said those forced at gunpoint in occupied eastern Ukraine to vote in a sham referendum actually really wanted to be part of Russia. He is buying the Kremlin talking points and the long list in total.

But as the President negotiates away Ukraine's freedom and America's credibility, Congress has an obligation and a constitutional responsibility to act. So I am glad this week that dozens of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle introduced legislation to make it clear to Russia that broad sanctions will be imposed if Russia does not negotiate in good faith and end this war soon. We owe Ukraine, and we certainly owe our own country nothing less.

## TARIFFS

Mr. President, on another topic of global importance, President Trump once again announced an escalation of trade wars with many of our closest allies and trade partners. He proclaimed it “Liberation Day” yesterday. “Liberation Day” is what he called it, but don't expect any ticker-tape parades or flag displays in the windows of American homes to celebrate this “Liberation Day.” The American public has been clear: They want to see prices come down, not go up. Americans are sick of paying too much for eggs and gas and for the everyday necessities they need to provide for their families, to commute to work, to pay the mortgage.

Trump's tariffs—or what I call Trump's national sales tax—Trump's national sales tax will do exactly the opposite. The 10-percent tariffs the

President announced will result in an increase of thousands of dollars in costs for the households of everyday Americans. Experts estimate that Trump's national sales tax—these tariffs—will cost the average family \$100 a week. That is \$5,000 annually. That is a lot of eggs.

Trump is pushing our economy in the wrong direction. During a time when many Americans are living paycheck to paycheck, this trade war is senseless, frivolous, and dangerous to American families' budgets.

Who in the world ever dreamed that the last election was about whether we want a trade war with Canada?

These tariffs are a tax hike on Americans and will cost businesses, consumers, farmers, and workers.

If Trump were less focused on annexing Canada and Greenland and Panama—and God knows who else—and raising revenue to pay for billionaire tax cuts, he would clearly see that the American people ardently disagree with his so-called “Liberation Day.” In fact, a recent poll found that 60 percent of Americans oppose the tariffs, and that is before they actually kicked in.

Look at the stock market today. How are you doing with that retirement account? Most Americans are not doing very well.

While the President claims that foreign countries will pay the tariffs, Americans know better. That burden of tariffs is carried by our companies and paid for by our consumers. Rest assured, the uncertainty and fear these tariffs will create will impact our Nation's workers and our economy.

America knows the economy is going the wrong way under Donald Trump. They won't be fooled. Witness what happened in Wisconsin just a few days ago. Even Trump's Rasputin, Elon Musk, cannot buy his way out of this mess. In fact, the only thing these tariffs are liberating is money from the wallets of hard-working Americans into the bank accounts of billionaires.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

## UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 154

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on a matter that should not require clarification.

In the United States of America, no President, Republican or Democrat, serves more than two terms. That is not a suggestion; that is not a tradition; that is the law of the United States, enshrined in the U.S. Constitution. Yet, once again, President Donald Trump is openly suggesting that he should have a third term.

In an interview with NBC News, he was asked directly about his repeated comments on seeking a third term. This time, he left no room for doubt. He said he was “not joking” about a third term—“not joking.”

So let's be clear. This is not the first time Donald Trump has toyed with the idea of clinging to power beyond what the Constitution allows. He has mused