

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

U.S. Attorney's Office. Her record should preclude her from receiving even an interview for an assistant U.S. attorney position. Instead, her loyalty at the expense of truth has won her a nomination for one of the most powerful Department of Justice positions in the whole country.

And her specific record around the work of the very U.S. Attorney's Office she is now nominated to lead reveals how unqualified and unsuitable she is for this role.

Here is the most important part of her background. Four and a half years ago, as we all know, rioters stormed the U.S. Capitol, contributing to the deaths of Capitol Police, injuring them severely, disrupting the vote-counting for President, and leaving devastation in their wake.

The U.S. Attorney's Office for DC was primarily responsible for bringing the January 6 rioters to justice, with praise from both sides of the aisle for the diligent and dedicated work they did to make sure that justice was done. For years, those prosecutors worked alongside the FBI to investigate, to build cases, to bring prosecution against the rioters. They didn't choose those roles or assignment; they were chosen by the Department of Justice to do their duty and enforce the law.

But on her radio show, Jeanine Pirro agreed with a guest who said the Department of Justice prosecutors handling the January 6 cases should be criminally prosecuted. She said:

I absolutely agree with that.

In her responses to this committee's questions, she failed to disavow this position. In fact, she failed to directly answer whether she believed Federal prosecutors assigned to work on the January 6 cases should, themselves, be prosecuted. In other words, she sided with the criminals.

She criticized the prosecutors who now will be in the office that she has been nominated to lead. Her criticism of them was to side with the conspiracy theorists and the call-in guests to her show as Judge Pirro. Rather than condemning pardons for people who committed violence against law enforcement, she simply wrote:

The decision to issue a pardon is a power that belongs to the President. That is what she answered when she was asked about pardons for January 6 rioters who had been convicted of violence against law enforcement.

Again, she refused to answer key questions. And, unfortunately, the Judiciary Committee failed to bring her forward as a witness, despite our requests and demands that she be a witness in her nomination proceeding. That is really regrettable on the part of the Judiciary Committee and, I think, an avoidance of responsibility that we owe the American people to scrutinize somebody who plainly raises such profound questions of qualification, even if you prize loyalty to Donald Trump.

This person who Donald Trump has nominated to be in this position of

trust and responsibility, plainly is not just unfit but would disgrace this office and diminish the credibility of the entire Department of Justice. That is the more profound question here, whether someone so unqualified will be confirmed after no testimony, after inadequate consideration, after simply agreeing because she is loyal to the President.

Rather than support the prosecution and conviction of people who assaulted law enforcement officers, she believes that the Federal prosecutors bringing those cases should, themselves, be investigated. The U.S. Attorney's Office that did those cases, the dedicated professionals who investigated them and the people of the District of Columbia—indeed, our Nation—deserve better.

I oppose her nomination. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, I am one of the newest Senators in this esteemed body. In fact, I just marked my sixth month here in the U.S. Senate.

Over and over and over again, you could just plug and play the same speech because, apparently, everyone nominated by President Trump to every position that we have to confirm as a body is wholly unqualified. That is what the Democrats would have you believe. In fact, I don't think we heard much else about any of the nominations.

If you look at the statistics going back administration after administration, Democrat and Republican, at this point in time, you saw 90 percent of nonmilitary civilian nominees confirmed. And how many of President Trump's administration have we confirmed? Zero. It is almost as though they are trying to thwart the will of the American people.

I stand here to reflect on a situation that I am astounded by as the newest U.S. Senator. In November 2024, the American people elected President Trump to be the 47th President of this Nation. And with that election, the people expressed their willingness to see this country move down a new path, a better path, a stronger and safer path, a path where leaders actually looked at the well-being of this country and the security of this country and the interests of our people and made commonsense policy decisions based on that and not some radical wish list that filled some Marxist governing philosophy. How about we get back to the founding ideals of this Nation?

How did the colleagues on the other side of the aisle respond to that election? What have we seen since January of this year when the 119th Congress set out to do the people's work? We have seen obstruction. It was the same response they have always had, a blend of histrionics and performance theater.

Instead of committing to the calls for reflection from within their own party

in the aftermath of an electoral loss, they resorted to obstruction in the name of democracy—in the name of democracy. I find it strange that in protecting democracy, it requires ignoring the will of the people.

Here in the Senate, both on the floor and in our committees, we have found that carrying out the people's will is being stymied every step of the way. We have seen Presidential nominees and legislation as opportunities for a performance. And every day this goes on, important positions critical to the national security and the well-being of this country and improving the lives of our citizens, those positions go left unfilled.

So while China continues to staff their diplomatic postings abroad and undercut the prosperity of our country, our Embassies go without Ambassadors. As our domestic Departments seek to unleash the American economy for the benefit of the working-class Americans, they are left without leadership. Our colleagues have sought to protect this country by obstructing the very exercise of the people's will, ensuring it is incapable of meeting the challenges of the moment.

So here we are, on a Saturday in August, voting on the President's nominees because our colleagues continue to hold out. This ultimately places this body and our Nation at a crossroads.

If we continue down this path, if we continue to allow obstruction at every turn or continue to allow people on the other side of the aisle to gain personal points or even political points, we weaken this body created by the Framers to carry out the responsibilities the American people have asked of us, protecting our liberty and protecting this Union.

I hope that our colleagues will avoid this path and join us in moving forward with putting Americans and America first.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, today marks day 212 of this new Congress under Republican leadership. I would offer to my colleagues this has been the most successful—the most successful—beginning of a Congress.

When you look at the nearly 750 hours that we have spent working and the 450 votes that we have taken, when you look at how we have pushed to move forward and how we have fought obstruction from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you do realize that we, indeed, are helping to fulfill the promise President Trump made when he said: We will make America safe, secure, healthy, productive, and great again.

Do you know what? That is precisely what the American people voted for. They want action. They want things to be done differently. Indeed, with a Republican House and Senate and this administration, led by President Trump and Vice President VANCE, they are delivering on this.

Look at the border. What we are seeing is a border that is secure. We know that we have some of the best numbers—the lowest illegal crossings that are coming across those borders. We are returning to building a wall. We are getting the Border Patrol what they need to do their job.

We have the Laken Riley Act, which Senator BRITT led here in the Senate. This helps to detain those criminal illegal aliens. We have the HALT Fentanyl Act that Senator GRASSLEY led, and we have Senator HAGERTY with the GENIUS Act to give us that first crypto bill to make certain that we retain the lead in that emerging technology legislation.

Those are all a few of the things that have been accomplished.

Of course, look at what we did in the One Big Beautiful Bill. Tennesseans are really looking forward to this bill because of what it does.

When you look at the fact that we got rid of a lot of that far-left Green New Deal spending, we have put money into modernizing our military for 21st century warfare and into Border Patrol agents, and we have the funding there that is needed. It is all there.

The people said: Let's get back to addressing our debt and restoring some fiscal sanity to this country. We have \$37 trillion of debt. We didn't get there overnight, and it is going to take a dedicated, focused, intentional process to get us out of this debt, to address it.

Of course, we are delighted—absolutely delighted—and we are so pleased to know that June was the first month in not a year or a decade but in three decades that this government ran a surplus.

Those are good signs.

Indeed, last night on this floor, we moved forward three of the appropriations bills. There are eight bills that have already come out of committee, and we processed three of those last night to make certain that we get onto a budget; that we get off of the Biden-era CRAs and onto the numbers that President Trump and our Appropriations Committee have moved forward on.

This marked the first time since 2013 that the Senate passed appropriations bills before the August recess. Now, that is so significant because what are the first things that we are supposed to do? One of them is to fund the government. And for my colleagues who always want to reduce Federal spending, which I am one of them, we have to go through the appropriations process to be able to do that.

Of course, in addition to the One Big Beautiful Bill, we also had the rescissions bill, which gave us an additional \$9 billion in cuts.

We need to realize, when we do these rescissions, that is the equivalent of taking that red pen and marking through those line items and saying: They are gone.

The American people wanted to see the high cost of living and inflation ad-

ressed. Indeed, with the One Big Beautiful Bill, we have been able to get things heading in the right direction. For Tennesseans, we know that there is going to be a \$2,600 per year savings in taxes with that One Big Beautiful Bill. We know that people are looking forward to this and that the One Big Beautiful Bill was the largest tax cut in our Nation's history. Indeed, we expect from the Council of Economic Advisers' numbers to see families in Tennessee increase take-home pay somewhere between \$7,000 and \$10,000. Those are numbers that are significant.

And do you know what that does? It says to people: We want you to have more control over your pocketbook—in how you choose to save your money, in how you choose to spend your money. All of those things are accomplishments. In 212 days of this Congress, those are all items that we have been able to move forward on.

Our other committees are hard at work. We are approving judges and getting them through the process, ready for floor votes. Indeed, the first appellate judge—appointed by President Trump and approved by Congress—was Whitney Hermandorfer out of Nashville. We look forward to seeing her on the Sixth Circuit. All of this we have moved forward at a rapid pace.

Now I want to talk about what has happened with nominees. Of course, everyone is aware we approved the Cabinet in record time in getting people to work. When it comes to those sub-Cabinet positions and judges and U.S. attorneys and U.S. marshals and Ambassadors, our friends across the aisle have enjoyed playing a game of obstruction. You know, it is as if they learned nothing on November 5.

Our friends across the aisle have lost at the ballot box; they have lost in the U.S. House and in the U.S. Senate. They have lost in the courts, and so now what we hear from many of them—and you can look at some of their campaign websites—is that they are holding resistance labs and encouraging people to obstruct. They think that they are harming us. What they are doing is harming the American people, thwarting the will of the American people.

They are trying to slow-walk these nominees. They are making a game out of it. How many can they hold back? But what they are doing is acting outside of the norm. What they are doing is proving to the American people that they are not here to address the issues of the day; they are here to see what they can stop.

I have got a chart with me that I think tells a great story. You will see the heading "Civilian nominees confirmed by voice vote or unanimous consent in first term." That is a President's first term. In order to provide context for what is happening in the U.S. Senate, I think it is important that we go back and look at history and see what that yields for us and the lessons that it yields.

As I said, these are nominees who are confirmed by voice vote or by unanimous consent in a President's first term. That is a practice that has been an accepted and expected practice of this body. When you have a deputy or an Under Secretary and sometimes nominees for different boards, they are grouped together en bloc, and then they are moved through the process together. They receive either a voice vote, or they move forward by unanimous consent. It simplifies the process. Many times, as I have talked to Tennesseans, what they have said is: We are not certain how many nominees there are. When you talk about President Trump not getting his nominees, are we talking about 100 people or 200 or 300? No. It is about 1,200 positions.

So let's put the context on this.

President George H. W. Bush: He had 98 percent of his civilian nominees confirmed by voice or unanimous consent.

President Bill Clinton: 98 percent.

George W. Bush: 90 percent.

President Obama: 90 percent.

President Trump's first term: 65 percent.

President Biden: 57 percent.

President Donald Trump's second term—zero—zero—not one—not one single nominee, not one. This is the obstruction that they are practicing within this Chamber.

Not only are they doing that, but they are wanting multiple votes. They want cloture filed. Then they want the cloture vote. Then they want the 2-hour period or the 4-hour for appellate judges while a Cabinet Secretary is a 30-hour clock to run. They are doing that on every single nominee. You can imagine how much time this would take if you have to follow this pattern for 1,200 people.

You see why it is deemed by many people in this country to be active obstruction by the Democrats. This is a practice that has gained steam under the current Democrat leadership. They feel like they are hurting the Republicans, but what they are doing is harming the American people because the agenda they voted for—what they wanted to see accomplished—cannot be accomplished.

Of what the American people voted for President Trump to do, our friends across the aisle would choose to slow-walk that. What they are doing is hurting the people they were sent here to represent.

I yield the floor.

(Mrs. BRITT assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Senator from Arizona.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed, after a very brief remark, to engage in a colloquy with Senator SCHIFF from California.

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

NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Just one quick point of fact into this maelstrom of faux outrage about Democratic obstruction, and that is that the proposal that has been made to the Republicans to resolve the customary August jam-up where we clear nominees would actually put President Trump ahead of the number of appointees that Republicans had allowed President Biden at this same time in his Presidency. So you can take what is being said here with a bit of a grain of salt.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Mr. President, what I wanted to discuss here with Senator SCHIFF was—Senator SCHIFF was an assistant U.S. attorney, which is one of the prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office. I was a U.S. attorney. U.S. attorneys have a higher but slightly more ceremonial role, I think assistant U.S. attorneys would be swift to confess, and AUSAs do a lot of the direct work.

One thing that Senator SCHIFF and I both noticed with respect to this Epstein saga has been that the Deputy Attorney General of the United States went out and did a direct witness interview with Epstein's coconspirator and Trump's friend Ghislaine Maxwell.

If you don't know the backdrop to this and how things ordinarily work in the Department of Justice, it is hard to fathom how very weird that was, so we would like to take a minute and describe, from our perspective, how it is that, in regular Department business, the engagement with witnesses takes place.

I will turn it over to the former assistant U.S. attorney to give his description of how and when a prosecutor would go into a room with a witness. But as I do that, let me just say that the Deputy Attorney General of the United States virtually never ever, ever, ever, ever, does. For somebody at that level to be involved is truly bizarre.

With that, let me give Senator SCHIFF a chance to engage in his part of the colloquy here.

Mr. SCHIFF. Senator, thank you.

There are lots of extraordinary and suspicious happenings around the Epstein case in the last few months. But just by way of background to those who may not be following each development, you have Epstein at one point describing himself as one of Donald Trump's closest friends. You have Donald Trump saying at one point that he shares a bond with Epstein over their mutual like of attractive women and pointing out that, in the case of Epstein, they tend to be on the younger side. You have the President recently acknowledging he is upset with Jeffrey

Epstein for stealing young women from Mar-a-Lago—by Epstein—for purposes that he did not disclose—the President did not disclose.

Tragically, in April, one of those women—one of those children, underage women—working at Mar-a-Lago committed suicide. She was a victim of the Ghislaine Maxwell-Jeffrey Epstein sex trafficking. Just this past April, she took her own life. But she was one of those women, apparently, that Trump was upset that Epstein was taking away from him at Mar-a-Lago. It certainly begs the question of, what did Trump think Jeffrey Epstein was doing with these young women he was taking from Mar-a-Lago?

So these are just some of the questions we hope will be answered, but, of course, after promising the MAGA base that he would disclose these files, after Bondi promised and Kash Patel promised and Trump promised, they have reneged on this.

So this is the backdrop in which Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche goes to visit the No. 1 coconspirator, Maxwell.

The other background piece of this is that Todd Blanche isn't just some Deputy Attorney General; Todd Blanche is Trump's former criminal defense lawyer. Todd Blanche is the guy who sat in the courtroom in Manhattan helping to defend Donald Trump against the Stormy Daniels allegations against him, for which Donald Trump was convicted of multiple felonies.

As you will remember from the Judiciary Committee when Blanche came for his confirmation hearing, you and I were both concerned about whether Blanche would be able to shed his role as Trump's criminal defense lawyer when he adopted the new role of being the No. 2 person in the Justice Department.

All of this begs the question of, when this very unusual thing happened where the No. 2 person at the Justice Department goes to talk to the coconspirator, this child sex predator, is he acting as Trump's defense lawyer or is he acting as a Deputy AG?

As you were alluding to, if this wasn't bizarre enough, for a top person like that to go interview a witness is unprecedented. For them to do it secretly—and we don't know if this was recorded; we don't know if an FBI agent was present. It would be unthinkable to do this in the absence of an FBI agent taking down the statement, but there is no evidence that took place.

The only thing we do know is that this interview lasted 9 hours, and after the interview, Ghislaine Maxwell got the special treatment of being moved from her prison in Florida to a minimum security prison in Texas that is like a camp, to which sex predators are not supposed to be sent. So why did she get that special treatment?

Finally, one other point I would make before I yield back to you about how unusual all this is, is the defense

attorney representing Maxwell is friends, apparently, with Todd Blanche, the Deputy Attorney General, and when Maxwell was asked "Are you hoping for a pardon out of this?" he basically said "We didn't ask for one, but of course the President has said he has the power to do it." They obviously want some special treatment. They are already getting it. But we have no record of any of this.

So, yes, this is so unusual, extraordinary, and unprecedented. And if they think this is going to somehow answer the questions that have been raised by their refusal to turn over these documents, it is the furthest thing from that, wouldn't you say?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I see that the Senator from Maryland has come to the floor to make his unanimous consent request, so let me yield to him since we are kind of into his time here.

But what Senator SCHIFF and I can both tell all of you is that it is extremely rare for even a U.S. attorney to go and do a witness statement and unusual in most circumstances even for an assistant U.S. attorney to go and do a witness statement. The reason for that is you then become a witness to what took place in that room, and you don't want to be both the prosecutor and the witness in the same case.

So the fact that he went in either alone or with no FBI agent or with no stenographer and became a witness to what took place sends off flares of concern to everybody who has served in that line of work.

With that, I yield.

Mr. SCHIFF. Can I make one last point, with your indulgence?

One other extraordinary fact about this is that none of the prosecutors who actually worked on prosecuting Maxwell were present. The reason you would want them there is, they know the facts. Blanche doesn't know the facts. So when you are interrogating this person, when you are taking their statement, you want somebody who knows the facts, who can attest to whether they are being forthcoming, telling the truth or not.

Also, a defense lawyer representing 20 of the Epstein victims asked to be present, and they were turned down.

This just stinks to high heaven.

I yield to my colleague from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California and the Senator from Rhode Island. They have well described, I think, all the inappropriate actions that have been taken by the Justice Department, including recently with respect to the Deputy Attorney General, who had been Donald Trump's personal lawyer, conducting the secret interview with the Epstein associate Maxwell.

This is an important conversation to continue here on the Senate floor. We were here earlier this morning, where