

and development are as important to preventing conflict as the threat of military force and a strong military, which we support.

It wasn't long ago that Secretary Rubio—then our colleague Senator Rubio—praised USAID's work in global health, in aiding victims of natural disasters, in supporting Venezuelans who were persecuted by that dreadful Maduro. Until Elon Musk decided that it is "time for [USAID] to die"—really said that, "time for [USAID] to die"—USAID previously had always received bipartisan support.

This is no time for the Congress of the United States, the U.S. Senate, to stand by passively while an Agency that plays a unique, indispensable role in protecting the interests and the influence, the security and the reputation of the United States around the world is decapitated and dismantled. Those responsible for this self-inflicted disaster have no respect for the law, no respect for the will of Congress, and no respect for the thousands of truly patriotic public servants who have devoted their lives to defending the interests of the United States and presenting a positive face of America in some of the world's most dangerous places.

I yield the floor.

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

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, it has now been more than 2 weeks since President Donald Trump took the oath of office, and there have been virtually no actions—virtually no actions—to lower costs at the grocery store.

On the campaign trail, Donald Trump made promises, over and over, that he would address rising costs. In fact, he said, "On day one, we will end inflation and make America affordable again." On day one.

And he said, "When I win, I will immediately bring prices down, starting on day one."

Well, way past day one, it is now day 16 of his Presidency, and so far, the Trump administration has failed to meet the President's own goal and promise to hard-working families.

Just look what it costs to buy milk, bread, and eggs. When Nevadans are going to the grocery store, many are seeing empty shelves where the eggs are supposed to be. And the eggs people do find, well, they cost an arm and a leg.

So just look at this picture here from Reno, NV, a grocery store there, empty shelves, that is where the eggs would be. And meanwhile, the Trump administration is doing nothing to help fix this or stop corporations from jacking up the prices. Instead, President Trump has been cozying up to billionaire CEOs and taking actions that will hurt families and drive prices up and up. Trump's first actions were to push through a whirlwind of Executive orders, including to roll back actions to lower prescription drug prices.

So I want to repeat that. One of President Trump's first actions was to stop efforts to lower your prescription drug costs. And just this past weekend, President Trump announced reckless tariffs on Mexico and Canada. This is essentially a new tax on hard-working families for products from these two countries—our biggest trading partners, by the way.

While he has promised to delay his tax on Canadian and Mexican goods for a month, ultimately these tariffs will hurt our economy. Canada is Nevada's biggest export partner. They provide us with chicken, with grain, sugar, and livestock. And the impact of these tariffs, well, they don't just stop at the grocery store shelves; they will also increase what you pay at the fuel pump. They will increase the price of construction materials, making housing even more expensive.

And so I ask everyone in this Chamber, I ask everyone across the Nation: How does that help you? How does that help you? How does it help lower costs? How does it help provide financial relief for families? How does it make your paycheck go farther? How does it put more money in your pocket? It doesn't.

President Trump, he is now even saying that inflation is no longer his No. 1 issue. He has flipped on his promise to you. He has flipped on his promise to you. And the fact is as Americans work hard every day, Nevada families, the finest families in our Nation, they work hard every day, and many are struggling to get by because prices have skyrocketed over the last few years.

It is why I have been taking action to lower costs for families and reduce their financial burden to give folks some much-needed breathing room, to make their paycheck go even farther. I am working to lower housing costs by investing in our construction workers to increase our housing supply. I helped lead the charge, last year, against the proposed Kroger-Albertsons megamerger that would have let grocery stores jack up prices even higher than they already are.

And there are steps we in Congress can take and have been taking to tackle inflation.

I urge the President to take this issue seriously and tackle it head on, and I am willing to work with him and work with anyone else if it means lowering costs for hard-working families.

But we need to get going right now. So I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to come together and prioritize solving kitchen-table issues, instead of pushing extreme wedge issues. It is what the American people need us to do for them. That is what the American people are counting on us to do for them. We need to get busy and do that.

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

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

NOMINATION OF PAMELA BONDI

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, shortly, Senate Republicans will confirm the nomination of Pam Bondi to serve as Attorney General and lead the Department of Justice in the new administration.

Yesterday, I came to the Senate floor to discuss the Trump administration's decision to purge Department of Justice officials and warned that Ms. Bondi's record suggests that she will aid in this effort to pack the Department of Justice with loyalists seeking retribution against President Trump's political rivals.

Since the Watergate era, there has been bipartisan support for the principle that the Department of Justice investigations and prosecutions must be independent from the White House. Over the years, both Republicans and Democrats have asked many individuals seeking the office of Attorney General one basic question: Will you be willing to tell the President no?

Given that Ms. Bondi, when speaking about President Trump's criminal indictments, threatened "the prosecutors will be prosecuted, and the investigators will be investigated," I have serious doubts about her willingness to really say no to this President.

This concern is even more pressing because, over the last 16 days, the Trump administration has purged dozens of senior career law enforcement officials at the Department of Justice and at the FBI. This purge has been particularly focused on dedicated, non-partisan prosecutors and investigators working in the National Security Division and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

On its first day, the Trump administration removed or reassigned as many as 20 experienced professionals with invaluable national security expertise, without any comparable replacements, including the veteran career Deputy Assistant Attorneys General in the National Security Division. These are men and women we have entrusted with the responsibility to keep America safe. They were summarily dismissed by this new President just days into his administration. Those who have been reassigned are reportedly being put in roles concerning immigration enforcement, for which they have little expertise.

We had a hearing this morning about fentanyl and talked about some 70,000 Americans each year losing their lives to this terrible drug. We are all concerned and expressed it at this hearing. But some of the very people who are working in drug enforcement are going to be removed and put into mass deportation of immigrants.

We have said over and over again that if the President is setting out to do what he promised he would do, he

needs more personnel to get it done or he will have to cut back invaluable functions of our law enforcement community at the risk of endangering the families and businesses in America.

Since that warning, dozens more senior officials have been removed. At the FBI, at least six FBI Executive Assistant Directors, or EADs, have been removed, including the EADs who oversee the National Security Branch, Intelligence Branch, and the Criminal, Cyber, Response, and Services Branch. The Trump administration has also removed special agents in charge of at least four major field offices and the Assistant Director of the Washington Field Office.

The Acting Attorney General has also issued a memo firing dozens of career DOJ prosecutors, stating:

Given your significant role in prosecuting the President, I do not believe that the leadership at the Department can trust you . . . in implementing the President's agenda faithfully.

The Trump administration has even asked line attorneys and agents to retire, resign, or be fired simply for handling tasks linked to the investigation of President Trump or prosecution of his misconduct.

The Acting FBI Director informed the entire FBI workforce that he was reviewing the files of "all current and former FBI personnel assigned at any time to investigations and/or prosecutions" relating to January 6 and unrelated terrorism cases.

Mr. President, if you are a student of history, you know that when the communists took over the Soviet Union, one of the things that they gloried in doing was rewriting history, trying to make the bad chapters, the embarrassing chapters, the sad chapters different so that future generations never were really quite sure what happened. That is exactly what is going on with January 6, 2021.

Despite the graphic video evidence of what happened on that day when this insurrectionist mob tried to take control of this Capitol and stop the transfer of power from Donald Trump to Joseph Biden—despite the clear evidence to the contrary, they continue to believe that this is a hoax, that somehow these were just tourists coming by the Capitol. Those of us who were there, those of us who remember the danger that was brought by these mobsters and thugs, know that is a lie.

Now they are going through the Department of Justice and saying: If you were involved in prosecuting any of these people who beat up on the policemen in this building, tore down the structures, broke the windows; if you were involved in any prosecution involving them, you are not welcome at the Department of Justice.

They want to rewrite history. They want future generations to believe the lie that they have perpetrated about what happened on that day. Those of us who were there will never forget what actually did happen.

The interim U.S. attorney for DC also ordered an internal review of staff handling cases relating to January 6, moved to dismiss all pending charges against those defendants, and has already fired dozens of prosecutors and investigators who worked those cases.

The people who were spared by the pardon of Donald Trump include individuals who are dangerous. One had a record of 38 convictions for crimes, and they are now back out on the street.

Over the past weekend, thousands of FBI personnel across the country were told to complete a questionnaire that asked a series of questions about their involvement in the prosecution and investigation of January 6.

This shameless partisan retribution is only the beginning. It has been reported that future FBI Director Kash Patel, if he is chosen by the Senate, will be guided by an advisory committee composed of solely partisan political operators, including an associate of Elon Musk's. Elon Musk. Who elected him? By what authority does he have any voice in the administration of our government? Why should he or his minions have access to the private records of American citizens? It is happening.

These actions will cripple FBI field offices and U.S. attorneys' offices across the country by increasing the caseload for the remaining agents, dramatically slowing down critical investigations and prosecutions.

The Trump Department of Justice is taking this partisanship beyond the President's personal grievances, as many as there may be. They are already dropping criminal investigations against the President's allies, such as Congressman ANDY OGLES. They also have begun systemically stripping the Department of Justice of vital, substantive expertise by reducing personnel from the law and policy sections of various divisions, such as the Environment and Natural Resources Division, which pursues polluters who poison our communities.

As America faces a heightened threat landscape, these shocking removals and reassignments of hundreds of employees deprive the Department of Justice and FBI of experienced leadership and decades of experience fighting violent crime, espionage, and terrorism.

For years, my Republican colleagues claimed they "back the blue" and accused Democrats of being soft on crime. We heard it over and over and over. But now, as President Trump is gutting our Nation's law enforcement Agencies and putting our national security at risk, my Republican colleagues do not complain. They are nowhere to be found.

Instead of condemning these actions, they will likely come to the Senate floor tonight and confirm an individual to lead the Department of Justice who is in lockstep with this policy of President Trump and was chosen for the role specifically because she is loyal. More than anything else, she is loyal.

I urge my colleagues to consider what a danger President Trump and Pam Bondi present to this Nation. I will oppose her confirmation and hope my colleagues will do the same.

I will also say letters went out today asking for further hearings on Kash Patel. I have been reading his response to the questions for the record—QFR—and I can tell you, they raise more questions than they answer. He has an attitude. To think this man will be in charge of 38,000 FBI agents and personnel, 400 field offices across the Nation and around the world, is going to have the authority to investigate those whom he chooses, is a frightening thing. His message in politics is "get even."

I read his book. It is called "Government Gangsters." This book, in specific detail, talks about his view of politics. He has a long list of grievances, political and personal, and he plans to get even. That is not the kind of person we need in charge of the FBI. He has no experience to point to of any significance which qualifies him for this job.

We have had many Directors of the FBI chosen for long periods of time because of our change in the law. We now have a 10-year period of service for the Director of the FBI, and we also do our best to make sure they are apolitical since they bridge various administrations, not just one or two. That is part of the law, and that is the reason we did it.

Now we are going to put a man in that position who has no experience, no background, and a political chip on his shoulder. I am afraid that is just a recipe for disaster.

I urge my colleagues to think twice about Pam Bondi and Kash Patel. This is not what we should expect or want from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Vermont.

**MR. WELCH.** Mr. President, I believe that the Attorney General may, in fact, be the most important position in a President's Cabinet, and if it is not the most important, it certainly is the most difficult.

Whoever is our Attorney General is a person that serves all of us. They have two clients. They have the President who appointed her or him and they have the Constitution.

Let me be clear that I have no objections to any President, including President Trump, appointing someone that the President is close to. President Kennedy appointed his brother. I do have a problem with any President seeing the job of Attorney General to be the person who runs "my Justice Department," and that is how President Trump has characterized it—"my Justice Department."

So we have this dilemma with respect to coming to a conclusion on the use of the responsibility that the Senate as an institution has for the advice and consent of a Cabinet member.

I start from the orientation that a President should be able to pick his team and that we should take up nominations and move on them, vote on them expeditiously. My orientation is that the President is entitled to the benefit of the doubt but not to a blank check.

What is also difficult for me with respect to this appointment is that, in my view, Pam Bondi is accomplished and competent and qualified. I have great respect for her work as a county prosecutor in Florida, and I have great respect for her work as attorney general in the State of Florida. I have great respect for the fact that, as a woman, she made that decision to run for attorney general and had to overcome pretty significant odds in order to win that position.

I also remember, Mr. Ranking Member, that she had great testimony from people whom she worked with, and I think both you and I have a great deal of respect for folks who have a leadership position and treat their subordinates with great respect and have their affection and confidence, and that came through in the testimony of people who have worked with Ms. Bondi.

My grave concern is really about President Trump and what he is clearly demanding of the person, whoever it is—and now it is Ms. Bondi—what the President is demanding, and that clearly is a loyalty oath to him as opposed to a demand for straightforward, candid advice, including, if the President is asking something to be done, like the prosecution of a political adversary, that the answer, Mr. President, has to be no. That is what the President is demanding. We can argue on both sides about whether that is the case, but the evidence is overwhelming.

The question that I have asked a number of nominees, including Mr. Patel and including Ms. Bondi, is, Who won the 2020 election? It is pretty clear that the President's team, in preparing folks for that inevitable question, came up with an acceptable answer. The acceptable answer is that President Biden was the President; President Biden was certified. No one could just say the straightforward: President Biden won.

In the closest election in our history, *Bush v. Gore*, after the Supreme Court made its decision, not only did Al Gore accept the outcome, but Democrats did, Americans did. That was pre-January 6 when we all relied on the guardrail in the Constitution that there would be a commitment to a peaceful transfer of power and that there would be renunciation of violence as a means of persuasion in the outcome of an election.

January 6 did change that. There was an attack on the Capitol. Many of us were here. That was inspired by President Trump. He invited people to come: "It will be wild."

It was provoked because the President used the enormous authority he had and the enormous credibility he

had with people who supported him to begin peddling the "Stop the Steal" narrative; the election was stolen.

President Trump has never, ever given up on that. As far as he is concerned, he says to every person and every audience: That election is stolen.

People who were going to work in his administration, in a vetting process, had to answer that question in the way that was acceptable to then-duly elected President Trump. That is not acceptable to me. It is not acceptable.

President Biden won. President Trump won this last election. I didn't vote for him, but I can say it. I can acknowledge it and do the best I can as a member of the minority party.

But we now have a President who is now allowing a person to have a dual loyalty to him, yes, and to the Constitution, to make it clear for that person who is nominated for a law enforcement position, that they accept his narrative of what happened in 2020. It is really dangerous, in my view, for our country.

The President has gone on, much to my regret, intensifying that concern that many of us have as to whether there will be an adherence to the rule of law.

In an extraordinary first 2 weeks, the President has gone on—it is my opinion, but a lot of courts support it—a rampage of illegality. It is a serious threat to our country.

Let me start with the impoundment—you know, basic civics. The article I branch—that is the U.S. Senate and U.S. House—has authority over appropriations and spending. The executive can propose, and we can consider, an appropriations request. The President can reject an appropriations bill that Congress passes with a veto. But what the President can't do is pick and choose where he feels like spending or just disregarding the appropriations passed by the Congress of the United States. And he is doing that.

The impoundment is patently illegal, not even close. And what is clear to me is the President doesn't care if the impoundment causes enough havoc that affected agencies will either be destroyed or severely damaged.

Let me give a couple of examples. When that impoundment notice went out, Wells River Community Health Center in Vermont—it provides healthcare to really poor Vermonters, and they do an incredible job. They have a cash balance that allows them to stay in business from 0 to 5 days. That is it. The impoundment notice comes in, literally, they show up to work, and it says: You shut down. You can't open up tomorrow.

Those folks running that organization don't have the money to pay the salaries of anyone: the doctors, the receptionists, the medical providers.

We see what is happening at USAID: "We are shutting you down." The doors are locked. People show up for work; they can't get in. That is illegal and unconstitutional, as I see it.

The administration, the President, has made a clear decision that he doesn't care. He is not going to worry about the niceties. Things that restrained Republican and Democratic Presidents before; namely, adherence to the law and recognition of their responsibility to preserve a tool that has been a safeguard for our democracy through both Republican and Democratic administrations, those rules don't apply to him.

Then we have seen that he has delegated authority to a nonelected billionaire—Mr. Musk—and told him, basically, to go wild with the Federal Government; do what you want; go where you want. And in one of the most astonishing things, they sent over—Musk sent over five kids. One of them is 19; he can't drink in Vermont—and four early-20-year-old folks. They marched in and the Treasury Secretary, basically, of the United States—the successor to Alexander Hamilton—a man I respect, by the way, Mr. Bessent, and the person who ran the payment system, and said: "We are in charge." That is basically what they did.

Then they got access to the computers, which means they have your Social Security Number and mine. They have information about our taxes. Every individual in this country, their privacy has now been put in jeopardy.

Just think if this were the private sector. Let's say you are Jamie Dimon, and you run a major financial institution, J.P. Morgan, and five kids show up at your bank. They say: Hey, Mr. Musk sent us. Give us access to the computers.

And they have access to all the individual information, company information, of the folks who work with J.P. Morgan. That is what happened.

It is not really apparent to all the American people what is happening. It is the folks who are directly impacted by this, the folks at USAID who don't have a job, the folks at Wells River Clinic who are operating on the tightest of margins who have suffered and don't know whether they will be able to keep the lights on. It is the woman, the mom, who had, finally, after months and months of trying, a dental appointment through Medicaid—they had it canceled arbitrarily and abruptly. Those individuals are feeling it, and this is going to ripple out to more and more Americans seeing what is happening.

We need an Attorney General who will share my shock at a President acting in such a lawless way.

The fact is, frankly, I don't think President Trump ever in the world would place a value on having an Attorney General who is willing to tell him: Mr. President, no, you can't get appointed unless you pass the test. And the test was on full display both with Mr. Patel and Ms. Bondi in their inability to answer the basic question: Who won the 2020 election?

My concern is not that they "get the answer right." My concern is that they

get that their profound responsibility is, first and foremost, to the Constitution and the rule of law.

The President is not looking for anyone other than someone who is going to give him the fealty that he demands when these questions arise.

What we are seeing with the President in these first 2 weeks of his term is that there is no restraint. The rule of law is for suckers. He is going to break things, and whatever damage is done is not his problem.

The problem is, there are a lot of really innocent good Americans who are being affected by this: doctors and nurses, moms whose children get Medicaid help, lawyers who dedicated their career to civil rights or environmental protection.

There is a cruelty with the way in which the President has acted. It is almost a casual cruelty that just doesn't matter. So I am looking for some confidence that the checks and balances that are required, that we can build up.

Frankly, there is a major question that we face as a U.S. Senator and each of us as an individual Senator. I believe, at least to exercise our judgment—we won't agree, necessarily, and we may come to a different judgment about how best we can do what I think each of us is required to do, and that is to protect the institutional responsibility of the U.S. Senate to be an independent, separate branch of government and to adhere to the importance of the separation of powers, and that this institution has a fundamental responsibility to the American people to be a check and balance.

There are 100 of us here, and we may have 100 different opinions as to when it is that we should say no, but my hope is that every single one of us will accept that it is our responsibility to make that judgment and not just passively submit to whatever action the President is sending our way.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I sit on the Judiciary Committee and was present for the confirmation hearing of Pam Bondi in her quest to be Attorney General of the United States.

I have to say that there is a lot to admire. She had been a competent prosecutor for many years. She was the twice-elected attorney general of a major State. And she said a lot of the right things about independence of the Department and rule of law.

What I couldn't get over was how things changed when she got to a topic that would have been sensitive to Donald Trump—something that would have gotten Donald Trump all twitchy. When she hit those topics, it was like, watching the plane fly into the Bermuda Triangle and all the naves and coms go crazy.

She couldn't say obvious things—things like: Did President Biden win the 2020 election? That is an easy answer: Yes, he did, sir—or ma'am. Super

simple. When she can't say that, that is a sign.

When she told us that there had been a peaceful transfer of power—a roomful of Senators who have had to flee this Chamber because of the violence of January 6 and go and shelter in a secret location, and she had to tell us that there had been a peaceful transfer of power. Again, haywire.

No predication, she said. She couldn't say there was no predication to go after somebody like Liz Cheney or Jack Smith. Predication is the key to being able to opening a case like that. The predication is pretty apparent—or its lack is pretty apparent, and she could not agree that there was no predication to open a case.

Last, she pretended that the candidate for FBI did not have an enemies list. He had an enemies list. He published his enemies list. He said that the people on his enemies list were criminals. He said that now it is time to go on the manhunt for the enemies that he identified on the enemies list. So when she can't state the obvious, it causes real concern.

It causes real concern because of the lawlessness this administration has already demonstrated in the first 2 weeks.

She got a lot of questions about pardons: Would she support violent offenders in the January 6 attack on the Capitol being pardoned? We were chastised for having asked such questions by our Republican colleagues who said: You know, you are asking her ridiculous hypotheticals. That will never happen. JIM JORDAN: Oh, that wouldn't happen. The President would never do that. Over and over again, Republicans said: Oh, that would never happen. Well, what happened? He pardoned the violent offenders.

In fact, some of them are already up to no good again. We have got some arrested for assaulting police officers. We had some shot in a violent confrontation with police officers. This is just in the 2 weeks since their pardons. And, here, soliciting a minor. That is the quality of people that the President was willing to pardon. So those pardons are another signal about a very strange and dangerous time that President Trump is taking us into.

As my colleague from Vermont just mentioned, we have got these little characters—I call them the muskrats—running around in Treasury, running around over at USAID, getting into systems where they have no business, where apparently they are not just able to get into the payment systems for Social Security and things like that—tax refunds, whatever—but they can actually manipulate the systems and they can leave backdoors so that Elon Musk can continue to access that data even after this raid by his little muskrats is over.

We don't know the details of what they have done, but there are probably a great number of laws, including privacy laws, that they are violating by

running around without proper authorization through these enormous accounting databases. And of course the billionaires that helped bring Trump to office live off data. Now they have access to one of the biggest datasets in the world. Do you think they are going to be responsible about that? I sure don't.

Right now in Rhode Island, funds are frozen, and people can't get straight answers about how they will ever get access to funding that has been duly appropriated, authorized, and obligated. The freeze of those funds by the President is now in violation of not one but two court orders.

So the lawlessness is apparent, whether it is the muskrats running around in Treasury looking at everybody's files or whether it is court orders being patently violated or whether it is violent offenders being pardoned so they can go out and solicit minors again.

I mean, the whole thing really calls for probity and good judgment and adherence to constitutional norms from an Attorney General, and when she can't answer as simple a question as "Did President Biden win the 2020 election?" my alarms go off. And they particularly go off when we get to her FBI Director, Kash Patel. She suggested she would be able to rein him in. I have my doubts.

He made completely preposterous explanations of how his enemies list wasn't an enemies list, even though he had called those people "criminals" and that there would be a "manhunt" for them. He denied having a role with the J6 Choir, which was a singing group of violent attackers from January 6, and he had taken credit for producing their recording but pretended he didn't know that they were January 6 violent attackers.

He assured us that FBI agents would be protected against political retribution, which was beginning as he testified and which is going on at the Department right now—massive, unprecedented political retribution.

He won't tell us what he told a grand jury in proceedings in which he pled the Fifth Amendment. Well, if you plead the Fifth and then you go into a civil proceeding, your having pled the Fifth is something that the civil attorney can use against you. It is called the adverse inference. A jury can draw the conclusion that the testimony that you would have given had you not asserted your Fifth Amendment privilege would be harmful to your case. They are legally available to reach that conclusion. A judge will instruct them that they may reach that conclusion.

Here we are in the Judiciary Committee, and we can't get an answer from this guy about his grand jury testimony. We know he pled the Fifth. And, what, are we not supposed to take the adverse inference that a regular jury would take from pleading the Fifth? It is a mess.

This guy Patel went into a court in Colorado to testify for Trump. How did

he do when he went in front of that court and testified? Well, the presiding judge said that he “was not a credible witness,” his testimony was “illogical” and was “completely devoid of any evidence in the record.”

OK. So I used to be a U.S. attorney, and we used to take FBI agents and we would put them into court to make cases. If an FBI agent working for me had gotten that kind of a response from a Rhode Island district judge—that he was not credible, that he was giving testimony that was illogical, that he could not be believed—there would be repercussions. We would need to see if that was a Giglio disclosure problem for this person. We would need to understand why this FBI agent couldn't be trusted by a Federal judge.

This isn't just an agent; this is the guy who wants to run the FBI. So to trust Pam Bondi to rein in a character like this who has “virtually no experience that would qualify him” to lead the FBI, says former Attorney General Bill Barr; who has ideas that are ludicrous—“absolutely unqualified for this job,” “untrustworthy,” “an absolute disgrace to . . . even consider him”; a guy who ran on his website, “Kash Patel retruthed,” imagery of him chain-sawing his enemies list people—this is actually a video clip. We can't play it here, but it is a video clip of him chain-sawing through his enemies list, and he thought that was cool to retruth.

That is the kind of person we are dealing with. Pam Bondi is going to be able to restrain him? Not if she can't even say that Joe Biden won the 2020 election.

This was his last comment. He said I had misquoted him. To the press:

We are going to come after the people in the media who lied about American citizens, who helped Joe Biden rig presidential elections.

Like he didn't win it.

We are going to come after you. Whether it's criminal or civilly, we will figure that out. But yeah, we are putting you all on notice.

That is what is coming to the Department of Justice. The FBI is in danger of being turned into the political enforcement weapon of this President, who is already breaking the law over and over again in just the last 2 weeks. And a woman who cannot say that Joe Biden won the 2020 election I believe is not going to be able to restrain this kind of misbehavior, let alone the kind of misbehavior we are seeing out of the Oval Office.

So regretfully—because there was a lot to like about Ms. Bondi—regretfully, I cannot possibly vote to confirm her.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, in examining all of the President's Cabinet nominees, I am focused on two things: their fitness and their qualifications for the positions to which they are

nominated, including their ability and willingness to put loyalty to the Constitution above loyalty to the President.

This independence is critically important for the Attorney General, our Nation's highest law enforcement officer. The Attorney General oversees thousands of career prosecutors in all 50 States, trying cases based not on politics but on facts.

However, Pam Bondi's record, her statements in her confirmation hearing, and her responses to questions for the record make clear she does not have the requisite independence to lead the Department of Justice.

In her confirmation hearing, Ms. Bondi shows she had trouble differentiating fact from fiction where her loyalty to President Trump might come into question.

Rather than attempting to assuage my concerns—concerns shared by many of my colleagues; you just heard from one of my colleagues just previous to myself—Ms. Bondi failed to provide clear and convincing answers to the following questions: whether President Biden won the 2020 election, whether she agreed with the President's characterization of January 6 felons as “hostages” and “patriots,” whether she would make good on her promise to “prosecute the prosecutors” and “investigate the investigators” by using the DOJ to go after the President's perceived political enemies.

I also asked her in writing, for the record, how she would resolve a conflict between a request from President Trump and her duty to the Constitution. Ms. Bondi provided no response, and she left the answer blank. This refusal to even try to answer the question told me a lot.

We have already seen in the 2 weeks since President Trump took office that he does not believe the rule of law applies to him. He issued an unconstitutional order on birthright citizenship. He put an illegal hold on all Federal funds. He fired or pushed aside scores of senior career FBI officials and Federal prosecutors.

Most egregiously, he issued a blanket pardon for more than 1,500 criminals convicted for their roles in the January 6 insurrection. Not content to stop at pardoning those who assaulted police officers, now he is compiling lists of FBI agents and DOJ prosecutors who did their jobs by working on January 6 cases to which they were assigned. This could be thousands of civil servants whom Donald Trump is apparently planning to punish to exact retribution.

Make no mistake, by focusing DOJ and the FBI inward on themselves instead of outward on the many threats against our country, President Trump is making our Nation less safe and sowing fear and chaos in the DOJ. When we suffer an attack, a hack, or a rise in crime, President Trump will try to blame everybody else, but he will be responsible.

As Senator DURBIN so accurately put it, Donald Trump sees the DOJ as his personal law firm, but the DOJ and the Attorney General work for the people, not for the President. Any President but especially this President needs an Attorney General who will tell him when his actions break the law. What is more, the American public deserves an Attorney General who will put the law first and refuse an illegal order from the President. Ms. Bondi will not be that person. She will be yet another “yes” woman doing whatever the President wants her to do. The law, the Constitution, and our country will suffer the consequences.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, colleagues, I, too, rise today to oppose President Trump's nomination of Pamela Bondi to serve as Attorney General of the United States.

And I don't do it lightly.

After evaluating her record, as well as her testimony before the Judiciary Committee, it has sadly become clear to me that Ms. Bondi is either unwilling or unable to put her duty to the Constitution of the United States and her duty to the American people above her loyalty to President Trump. With a President now in office who has proven his complete disregard for the rule of law on numerous occasions, Pam Bondi is simply unfit to serve as our Nation's chief law enforcement officer.

Time and again, we have seen Ms. Bondi more than willing to go on national television and push President Trump's lies about the results of a free and fair election. Despite the facts, despite overwhelming evidence, she has chosen to lie to the American people in defense of Donald Trump.

Now, as I shared in committee during the confirmation hearing this very issue, offering her an opportunity to withdraw those statements that she made back in 2020, reminding my colleagues and anybody watching that the danger of her refusal isn't just that she is sticking to some political talking points—in fact, when it comes to the integrity of our elections, lies have become threats to our democracy, threats to voters, and threats to election workers who dedicate themselves to administering our free and fair elections.

To this day, she refuses to state the simple truth that Donald Trump lost in 2020. Colleagues, consider the fact that these same lies have led to her associate Rudy Giuliani being disbarred. Think about that contrast. Rudy Giuliani lied, and he is being disbarred for those actions. Pam Bondi—same lies—refuses to take them back, and now you want her to be the top law enforcement officer for the United States of America?

It is this very behavior that actually endears her to President Trump, and it

is the same reason why we cannot trust her to hold him accountable. If confirmed, Ms. Bondi will no doubt face far more daunting challenges to shield the Department of Justice and its professional civil servants from politics.

I mean, just look at President Trump's activities in the first couple of weeks in office. From his first day on the job—day one of his second term—he issued around 1,500 pardons for January 6 insurrectionists and commuted the sentences of 14 of his supporters, including those convicted of violence against police officers.

Let me say it again: The first day in office, Trump freed convicted violent criminals who pepper-sprayed and beat Capitol Police officers—so much for “Back the Blue.”

President Trump's appointees then proceeded to fire career Department of Justice lawyers involved in investigating and prosecuting him for his role in the January 6 insurrection and for his improper handling of classified documents. Now, the Acting U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia has already promised to investigate the prosecutors who helped put violent insurrectionists behind bars.

None of this comes as a surprise. Before she was even selected, before the nomination was official, Ms. Bondi had already publicly promised to investigate the investigators, to prosecute the prosecutors.

And just this past Sunday, President Trump's Department of Justice demanded specific FBI staff fill out a questionnaire sharing what involvement they had in the January 6 cases. This is a tough environment for any Attorney General to walk into and to act independently, let alone someone who has already shown blind loyalty to President Trump over the rule of law.

But these past few weeks, I was struck most by the fact that, despite her having practiced law for decades, despite the fact that she served once as the attorney general for the State of Florida, Ms. Bondi was somehow unfamiliar with the 14th Amendment of the Constitution and, specifically, its citizenship clause.

It shouldn't have come as a surprise. We talked about it in my office the day before the hearing. I let her know I was going to be asking her about it during the hearing. And when I gave her an opportunity during the hearing to discuss it, she simply refused to answer my questions, and now we know why.

In his very first day back in office, President Trump issued a blatantly unconstitutional Executive order seeking to strip birthright citizenship from American citizens—citizens born here in the United States.

Now, someone who still needs to study birthright citizenship surely won't be a champion in defending it. And I point that out because that is what Ms. Bondi said in response to my question that she would “study” it.

Think about that, colleagues. The top law enforcement officer in the

United States needed to study the Constitution?

The American people need and deserve to be able to trust that the Department of Justice is enacting the law fairly, neutrally, and free from political interference. We need and deserve an Attorney General who will speak truth to power; push back against illegal, immoral, and unethical requests; someone who can be a credible messenger to the American people in a time of crisis; and someone who will defend not only the American people but the proud public servants who work within the Department and who are being purged in not a Saturday night massacre or a Monday massacre but a January massacre by President Trump.

To my colleagues today, I ask this: Do you believe Ms. Bondi will fight against retribution or enact it? Do you believe she will stand up to the administration's chaos or further enable it?

Colleagues, I don't believe Ms. Bondi is up to the task, and for that reason, I will oppose her nomination, and I urge all of you to join me.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from California.

**MR. SCHIFF.** Mr. President, just over 8 years ago, Donald Trump assumed the Office of the Presidency for the first time. He began that administration with at least a few people of independence and stature, people that had enough of a respect for themselves and the rule of law that, when they were asked to do things that violated the law, their oath, or their own sense of decency, they said no or resigned—people like Defense Secretary Mattis, who wrote in his resignation letter:

My views on treating allies with respect and also being clear-eyed about both malign actors and strategic competitors are strongly held and informed by over four decades of immersion in these issues. We must do everything possible to advance an international order that is most conducive to our security, prosperity, and values, and we are strengthened in this effort by the solidarity of our alliances.

Because you have the right to have a Secretary of Defense whose views are better aligned with yours on these and other subjects, I believe it is right for me to step down from my position.

Treating allies with respect; being clear-eyed about malign actors; advancing an international order conducive to our national security, prosperity, and values; the solidarity of our alliances—these didn't use to be novel ideas. They didn't used to be controversial ideas. What Secretary Mattis said about an “international order that is most conducive to our security, prosperity, and values” may also be applied to a domestic order that is respectful of our Agencies and institutions, our norms and values.

Not everyone in Trump's first administration was like Secretary Mattis. Some took much longer to realize that the President's demand for loyalty to him be placed above all else was incompatible with their own oath of office.

Attorney General Bill Barr, once so desperate for a job in the Trump administration that he wrote a lengthy job application castigating an investigation he knew little about, found, ultimately, that there were lines even he could not cross, like lying about the election.

Others still, like Kash Patel, seemed never to find a demand by the President too taxing of their own moral code to raise an objection, but rather viewed any questionable order as a means of advancement.

The question we face with the nomination of Pam Bondi is, What will she do when, inevitably, she is put to the test by a President who feels unbound by law or propriety?

Her testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee tells us that she will not pass the test. When asked about whether the President lost the 2020 election, she could not answer. When asked whether she would preserve evidence gathered in the January 6 investigation, she could not agree to do so. When asked about potential pardons of violent criminals who attacked police on January 6, she indignantly assured us that she would review all pardon cases on a case by case basis—a promise breached by the President so soon thereafter that her words seemed still to hang in the air.

If she could not assert her independence now, before Congress, before taking office, what hope can we have that she will do so when put to the test by the President?

When asked about this, too, she demurred: That is a hypothetical.

But it wasn't then, and it isn't now. The President has already pardoned hundreds of violent criminals. He has already issued Executive orders that violate the law and Constitution.

Would Pam Bondi have objected to the firing of inspectors general? Do any of us believe that she would?

The President has issued an Executive order attempting to amend the Constitution. A Federal judge struck down this order as presenting perhaps the simplest constitutional question he had ever heard. Could we have expected Pam Bondi to defend it? Sadly, yes.

The President issued an Executive order freezing and illegally impounding congressionally appropriated funds. Would she have uttered a word of protest? Certainly not.

Dozens of top prosecutors have already been fired, by the Department of Justice, who did their lawful duty investigating the rioters who attacked police. Would she have resigned in protest?

She has witnessed this Saturday night massacre and still wants the job. So, plainly, the answer is no.

She is no Elliot Richardson. Top-ranking FBI agents have been fired. Questionnaires have gone out to identify the hundreds—perhaps thousands—of agents who were involved in the legitimate prosecution of these felons. Would she have defended these FBI



agents at the risk of her own job, as one senior FBI leader has done? Of course not, and let us not pretend otherwise.

Donald Trump only took the oath of office a mere 2 weeks ago—with an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, to faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States, to faithfully execute the laws of this country that Congress passed and funded. Each day, it seems he has found new ways to bend and break those laws, to put in power unelected billionaires and political cronies to dismantle Agencies, take control of payment systems, and exact political retribution.

One after another, each of his nominees, asked whether they would oppose such conduct, has claimed that they won't engage in hypotheticals, claimed that there was simply no way the President would take these actions, stated that what the President promised to do during the campaign simply wouldn't happen. But it is happening. It has happened. His campaign of retribution is happening. His empowering of a shadow President is happening. His dismantling of congressionally approved Departments is happening.

We cannot afford an Attorney General who believes their role is to defend him rather than the American people and the democracy we have inherited from our Founders—this big, bold, brave, and improbable experiment in self-governance. We need an Attorney General with a backbone of steel, with a stature to say no, whose purpose is to enforce the laws against any law-breaker, including the President of the United States. That person is not Pam Bondi.

Senator Rufus Choate, who once walked these halls and served in this body, reminded us nearly 200 years ago that we have built no temple but the Capitol, that we consult no common oracle but the Constitution. And what does that oracle tell us? I think maybe simply this: We have been given the most brilliant Constitution ever devised to constrain the worst impulses of human nature, but even that brilliant document will not protect us if we do not inhabit positions of great responsibility with people worthy of them, with people who view our system of checks and balances not as a weakness to overcome or to overrun but as a source of strength, who view the domestic order they produce, to borrow Secretary Mattis's words from a different context, as "most conducive to our security, prosperity and values."

We need an Attorney General who will stand strong when the President seeks to turn this Capitol into a rubberstamp for unconstitutional and unlawful actions, when the President seeks to empower the likes of Elon Musk to ignore laws that Congress has passed and Departments that Congress has funded, when the President ignores our allies and emboldens our enemies, when the President targets those in

government who did their job to investigate crimes and malfeasance and does so to exact vengeance. Vengeance. Apart from self-aggrandizement and self-enrichment, the President's only motivation—vengeance.

Donald Trump is hoping that in the chaos of his Executive orders, of oligarchs marauding through the Agencies of government, of tariffs that turn on and off like a blinking light, that we will get lost and in getting lost, be lost. We must not be.

His actions will get worse. They will. With a congressional majority that empowers him, with appointees that embolden him, he himself will only grow more emboldened in return. His unconscionable and unconstitutional actions will multiply, and when that happens, will Pam Bondi take up her role, her duty, as the people's lawyer or will she serve as the President's lawyer as she has done before? Will Pam Bondi say no to the President's unlawful actions? no to purges of perceived political enemies? no to investigations of career officials? because if she will not say no, if she cannot say no, it is up to us today to say no. No to this nomination. No to Pam Bondi. It is up to us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, as my colleague Senator SCHIFF from California has just so powerfully stated, we are in the midst of a constitutional crisis—a crisis that would have been unimaginable just weeks ago, a crisis that involves a President disobeying the law.

Now, Presidents in the past have disobeyed the law. They have sought to test the boundaries of their power, and the courts have blocked them. But never has a President violated so many significant laws and the Constitution so rapidly, so repeatedly, that we are, as Senator SCHIFF said, lost in the chaos. And it falls to the arbiters of law—our courts—but it is also incumbent on the enforcers of the law.

Any of us who have served in the Department of Justice—I was U.S. attorney for Connecticut for 4½ years—knows that the most important decisions that any prosecutor, any law enforcer makes is whether to uphold the rule of law and sometimes say no to an FBI agent who is too enthusiastic about a case and wants to indict someone who could not be convicted, a public official who is close personally or politically and has overstepped their powers or ethics. To be fair, independent, objective, to be completely impartial, and to uphold the rule of law is the first duty of anyone in the U.S. Department of Justice.

I have more than respect, I have reverence for the Department of Justice, and that is why I am so deeply disappointed that we are here tonight for the nomination of Pam Bondi.

The Attorney General of the United States of America is supposed to be the people's lawyer, not the President's.

Donald Trump has said he wants the Attorney General to be his Roy Cohn, his fixer, his personal attorney.

Well, Ms. Bondi said she would be the people's lawyer, but that claim is betrayed by almost everything else she said and, most importantly, what she would not say.

Here is what she would not say. She would not say that she would say no to the President when he asked her to do something illegal or immoral. She dodged that question. She would not say that she was wrong for spreading lies about fraud and cheating in Pennsylvania during the 2020 election. She dodged that question, too. She would not say that President Biden won the 2020 election or that President Trump lost. She ducked it.

Now, the issue of whether President Trump asked his Attorney General to do something illegal or immoral is not a hypothetical. It is not abstruse or abstract. It is real. We know it is real because every one of his past Attorneys General ran afoul of Donald Trump because they would not do something illegal or immoral—our colleague Jeff Sessions, Bill Barr. No matter how good their intention, nobody can talk Donald Trump out of what he wants to do, and the law is no concern, nor is the lawyer. He will get lawyers to do whatever he wants, and Pam Bondi was reassuring—very reassuring—to one person—Donald Trump—when she dodged those questions because what he wants is a loyalist, a sycophant, an acolyte, and he wants a puppet to do his bidding.

The American people need a lawyer at this moment in history, at this point of constitutional crisis, who will truly speak truth to power. We use that phrase all the time, "speak truth to power," but in this instance, it is the essence of what an Attorney General has to do at this moment in our history. And Donald Trump doesn't want to hear the truth. As much power as he has, he wants to hear an Attorney General tell him: Fine to go ahead. You have the green light.

If Pam Bondi thinks she won't face that same dilemma that Bill Barr and Jeff Sessions did and every other lawyer who has worked for Donald Trump has faced, she is either delusional or disingenuous—delusional or disingenuous. For me, both are disqualifying for this job. And she can't even pass that low bar of saying she could say no. Her answer is: Oh, well, he would never do anything like that. He is my friend.

As we are here tonight, the Trump Justice Department is reported to be preparing to purge hundreds or even thousands of FBI agents or other personnel in the Department of Justice for nothing more than doing their jobs. These agents were assigned to criminal cases involving Donald Trump. They didn't leap forward. They didn't volunteer. They were assigned, and, like FBI agents do, they took the assignment. Now they will pay a price in their careers unjustly, unfairly, and unwisely

because it will deter other FBI agents from doing their job when it comes to drug cases or terrorism cases.

We have heard also that assistant U.S. attorneys are being reassigned from drug cases and terrorism cases so that they can do immigration. We are hearing that career civil servants must be loyal to Donald Trump in this Department of Justice—well, to Donald Trump and to them.

We all know something fundamental in this body—that we swear an oath. The lowliest private in the U.S. Army or the Navy or the Marine Corps or the Air Force takes an oath. They raise their right hand, just as we do. Anybody in the Cabinet takes that oath, and they swear allegiance, but it isn't to the President, and it isn't to the government; it is to the Constitution. That is what is at risk here. That is what Pam Bondi cannot do in good conscience if she is confirmed because her allegiance will be to Donald Trump.

The purge of agents and the reassignment and retribution of others not only damages morale, the effectiveness of the Department of Justice, it undermines the rule of law.

The Attorney General—perhaps chief among Presidential appointees—is responsible for making good on the constitutional promise that no man or no woman is above the law, that we have no king in the United States. We are no longer a monarchy. We can no longer ask a billionaire to rummage through the files of the Department of Treasury that have information about the Presiding Officer and every one of us who serves in this body and almost every American because we all pay taxes; we all have Social Security; we get tax refunds. Veterans get disability benefits. Almost anything the U.S. Government does creates a record in the Treasury Department, and all that information is being read and scanned and now collected. That is the news of the day.

More bad news about Elon Musk. Who is going to stop Elon Musk when he is doing something illegal and immoral? It won't be Pam Bondi because she is Donald Trump's lawyer. That is a real and present danger for every one of us in this country.

After I was U.S. attorney in Connecticut—I was the attorney general of my State for 20 years. In that job, also, I took an oath to the Constitution of the United States as a State official, as well as to the constitution of the State of Connecticut. It isn't an abstract notion; it is what we all do. If she is confirmed, maybe Pam Bondi will be able to raise her right hand and recite after whoever is administering the oath, but it will not be an oath she is capable of keeping.

And so on this critically important vote for our country, I don't think there is a Cabinet officer more important at this moment in our history. I urge my colleagues to say no to this nomination.

I yield the floor.

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

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

#### VOTE ON BONDI NOMINATION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

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

Mr. THUNE. 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.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 33 Ex.]

##### YEAS—54

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

##### NAYS—46

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

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.

The majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Turner nomination be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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 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. 11, Eric Turner, of Texas, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

John Thune, Markwayne Mullin, Jim Justice, Tom Cotton, John Barrasso, David McCormick, Steve Daines, Joni Ernst, Roger Marshall, Deb Fischer, Chuck Grassley, Bernie Moreno, Ted Budd, John Kennedy, John Boozman, Tommy Tuberville, Cindy Hyde-Smith.

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 Eric Turner, of Texas, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, 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.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 34 Ex.]

##### YEAS—55

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

##### 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
Gallego	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 45.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Eric Turner, of