

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, soon, we will vote on the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Florida.

Until recent years, it has been unheard of to use floor time to confirm U.S. attorneys. Typically, they are confirmed by voice vote. I regret that we have become a body where every nominee has been obstructed. U.S. attorneys keep our communities safe and ensure law and order is enforced. There are 93 U.S. attorneys in the United States. It would take more than 230 hours to confirm all of them. That is totally unrealistic, and that is not hypobole.

The Democrats' obstruction of nominees is hindering law and order across our Nation. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I will continue to work across the aisle to restore a common-sense confirmation process for U.S. attorneys.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON BURCH NOMINATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Burch nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 488 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

Scott (SC)
Sheehy

Sullivan
Thune

Tuberville
Young

NAYS—44

Alsobrooks
Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt Rochester
Booker
Cantwell
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Fetterman
Gillibrand
Hassan
Heinrich

Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kim
King
Klobuchar
Lujan
Markey
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Reed

Rosen
Sanders
Schatz
Schiff
Schumer
Shaheen
Slotkin
Smith
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Gallego
Kelly
Kennedy

McConnell
Tillis
Welch

Wicker

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.

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. 151, Jason Reding Quinones, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, Markwayne Mullin, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Bill Cassidy, Kevin Cramer, Todd Young, David McCormick, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Rounds, Marsha Blackburn, Shelley Moore Capito, Pete Ricketts, Ashley B. Moody, Roger Marshall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jason Reding Quinones, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years, 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 Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 489 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—6

Gallego
Kennedy

McConnell
Tillis
Welch
Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jason Reding Quinones, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

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

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

NOMINATIONS

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, Americans want Congress to deliver. Americans want Congress to work. They want Congress to not just work as in being here but work as in collaborate and cooperate in order to get things done. But the reason there are such low expectations is because of days like today.

My colleagues—are they proud of this? Is this what they think their constituents want?

If you go back to any State and talk to, like, normal people—Democrat, Republican—they probably all agree that

this place worked better. So why do my Democratic colleagues seem intent on undermining the normal operating procedure of the Senate, frankly grinding us to a halt? Who is asking them to do this? If they go to the States, are their Democrat voters saying: Hey, listen, can Congress do a worse job? Can you become even less effective?

Now, if you would be too embarrassed to ask your own constituents, you should be embarrassed now.

We are 7 months into President Trump's administration, and we have approved zero percent of his nominees by voice vote or unanimous consent.

You may say: Well, that is not anything strange.

No, it is quite strange. You can see that under H.W. Bush, 98 percent of the nominees were voice vote or unanimous consent; President Clinton, a Democrat, 98 percent; George W. Bush, 90 percent; Barack Obama, 90 percent; Trump 1—if you don't like Trump, you could have stopped then—65 percent; and then President Biden, 57 percent. I guess there has been a decline, but this is an abrupt stop.

It is frustrating. Zero percent. Zero percent.

Now, we would all like to be with our families. We would like to be meeting our constituents. We would like to find out what is going on in our own districts. But we are having to battle this in order to get some of President Trump's nominees through.

By the way, as others have emphasized, these are not controversial nominees. This is like the Ambassador to the Vatican. That is about as non-controversial as you can be. These are like not the Cabinet Secretary, not the Deputy Cabinet Secretary, but a couple positions below that. So this is obstruction for the sake of obstruction.

The other thing that concerns me terribly—Roy Blunt, a former Senator from Missouri, used to say that whatever one party does to the other party, that party will do it to the other going forward, which is to say that we create precedents in this Chamber. We have always had a precedent of having a significant percentage of people who have been confirmed by voice vote or unanimous consent, as we just pointed out on this chart. But now we have to grind, grind, grind—2 hours of debate between when someone is first put up until there is a final vote. But no one in the Chamber debates; it is just that for 2 hours, you find something to do. That will set a precedent.

Now, I love the Senate because I love my country. And our Founding Fathers set up the Senate to be the place where we would come—we the people, with our representatives, would come and make laws that are beneficial for our country.

I grew up with this incredible esteem of the Senate, and now we are seeing the Senate ground down, where the comity, the cooperation that allowed people with different perspectives to come together and find common

ground for the benefit of our country is being exploited merely to delay President Trump's agenda. The Ambassador to the Vatican—putting a stop on his nomination and then his final approval doesn't really stop the President's agenda.

So it is not just shattering precedents, it is creating new ones, establishing a pattern where next time, if Republicans are in the minority, we will, unfortunately, feel motivated to create the same gridlock that is being created here.

I don't know of any American who wants that. I don't know of the most partisan American who wants that because they know that when their side is in power next time, they will want to get something done.

By the way, we are talking about the Ambassador to the Vatican. This is not—this is not—the Secretary of Defense. This is not—you name the position.

Now, I know my Democratic colleagues care about the institution as much as I, and I appeal to that concern. I appeal to that sense of, we have to make this place work if it is going to work for the American people, and must be careful about what we do because it will be done unto us.

I suppose this could be done in the name of resistance. I would say it is resistance to the will of the American people—the American people that want the Congress, that want the Senate to function, to get on to bigger and better things, to not break precedent to set a new precedent where, in the future, we work even less well together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

NOMINATION OF JEANINE PIRRO

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, in just a little while, later this afternoon, we will consider confirmation of Jeanine Pirro as U.S. attorney for the district of Washington, DC.

Now, I have a particular feeling about appointments as U.S. attorney, having served as one in Connecticut and having seen how profoundly impactful it can be on the lives of everyday Americans.

Obviously, it is a position that is integral to justice in the United States. It is the top Federal prosecutor in that district. In DC, it is the largest office in the whole country and probably one of the two or three most important because it has jurisdiction over all of the Federal Agencies, Federal employees, Federal issues that arise in this profoundly significant place.

Like any prosecutor in the Federal system, it is a position of absolutely staggering importance and power. I learned as U.S. attorney that probably the most important decision I made was whether to bring an indictment; that is to say, whether to charge somebody with a crime. Most—almost all—were convicted. But convicted or not, speaking generally, somebody charged with a crime suffers damage for life—

financial harm, reputational impact, families often disrupted. And that is no reason to avoid bringing charges but only to make sure that someone who is making those final decisions is independent, objective, and nonpolitical in the way they go about the job.

Jeanine Pirro is unqualified to be U.S. attorney. She is unfit for this role. She is simply a loyal political acolyte and sycophant of the President. Loyalty is the reason she has been nominated, not experience. She is not objective. She is not independent. In fact, she is essentially an entertainer. Nothing wrong with being an entertainer, but it is not a qualification for being U.S. attorney.

In fact, on her show, she has made Islamophobic comments so offensive that FOX News temporarily suspended her from the air. She has promoted a wide variety of damaging, offensive conspiracy theories, including the thoroughly debunked allegation that some pro-choice States allow doctors to kill fully delivered, breathing babies. She was a key figure in promoting the entirely baseless claim that the 2020 election was stolen. Her public record essentially disqualifies her from serving as the chief Federal prosecutor.

Her nomination is more serious and more profoundly important than just her particular place. It is, in a sense, a symbol of what President Trump is doing to the U.S. justice system. My Republican colleagues are simply not only willing to place her at the head of the largest U.S. Attorney's Office in the country, last week, they moved her nomination forward by a party-line vote. They rallied behind her, not in spite of her record but because of it—again, simply because she is loyal to the President.

So the issue here is not only about her; it is about whether loyalty will qualify somebody for this kind of powerful position in the U.S. Department of Justice, which is supposed to be above politics, when she has demonstrated that, in fact, she would be totally unfit for any such office.

How loyal is she? Well, she was individually discussed in the defamation lawsuit against FOX News for promoting 2020 election conspiracies. Her totally false comments were at the center of that defamation case. FOX News canceled an episode of her show after the 2020 election with a FOX executive producer, saying: "I don't trust her to be responsible." A FOX producer called her a "reckless maniac" in an internal email. These were her colleagues, her coworkers, her producers. One of them asserted that "she should never be on live television" and described her draft of a monologue as "rife w[ith] conspiracy theories."

That defamation case ended in a settlement in which FOX News agreed to pay \$787 million, in part, because of statements she made on the air.

The history of peddling conspiracy theories on cable news should be fundamentally disqualifying for any prosecutor, let alone the head of the largest