

President Trump's threats to deploy the military to Chicago and other American cities.

If this President and this administration want to join in fighting crime on a cooperative, bipartisan basis, count me in, but political theater, visions of Chicago being blown up by a Department of War—I want no part of it.

As this situation unfolds, my office remains in constant contact and coordination with State and local officials, community leaders, and my colleagues in Congress. I will continue to provide updates to Illinois as we learn more.

These are scary times. The President is using fear to deflect and drive a wedge among us. Unfortunately, he seems to be succeeding to some extent, but the people of Chicago won't take kindly to a bully and a wannabe dictator.

On Saturday evening, thousands of marchers peacefully passed by Trump Tower and filled the streets of Chicago to make their voices heard. They were clear in their call: Mr. President, do not send the military here for political purposes.

I was happy to join in the parade in the Pilsen neighborhood of Chicago to celebrate Mexican Independence Day.

These are good people, good families, hard-working, churchgoing, doing their best in a tough economy to survive. They are not a threat to anyone's safety, and they are certainly not the cause of crime in Chicago.

At that celebration, there was an attendee by the name of Liliana. She felt it was important to come out on behalf of many who were scared to leave their homes. Standing out on the sidewalk, she said:

We're here. We're not going away. No matter what generation, no matter what threat, no matter what President is in office—we're not going away.

Thank you, Liliana. She is right. In the face of threats and intimidation, our immigrant community in Chicago as a whole will stand firm and stand tall.

Let us join together as a nation to fight crime and to fight the gun epidemic that is part of violent crime, but arresting and deporting innocent families is not the way to fight crime.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, for the second time in a week, I come to the floor to implore my Democratic colleagues to stop partisan obstruction of public safety officials. We have 10 highly qualified nominees on the Senate floor right now waiting for confirmation. Several have blue slips from Democratic Senators. All were reported to the floor by voice vote. There is no reason that we shouldn't get them to work for the American people today.

As I explained just a few days ago, communities around our country are in

desperate need of U.S. attorneys to protect the public and uphold the rule of law. Eighty-one percent of Americans think that crime in large cities is a major problem. If we can agree to put partisanship aside, this body can take a tangible step to address this today by confirming 10 qualified law enforcement officers to their posts.

I am disappointed that my Democratic colleagues have chosen to place partisan obstruction over public safety. I am here again today to give my colleagues a chance to do the right thing.

This blanket obstruction of all nominees is a misguided attempt to score political points. I know that several of my Democratic colleagues agree with me because just a few months ago, some of them stood on the Senate floor and made the same argument that I am making today.

In one speech last Congress, the Democratic whip and chairman of the Judiciary Committee said:

Don't stand up and say you're for law and order, you're for law enforcement, and then turn around and stop the appointment of U.S. attorneys.

In another speech, the same Senator said:

Our communities desperately need top federal prosecutors in place. Interested in stopping fentanyl? I am. Thousands of people are dying. Who's going to prosecute these cases? The U.S. Attorneys—93 of them across the United States. But you can't prosecute the case if you don't have the U.S. Attorney there to lead the effort, coordinate the effort with other branches of government.

My Democratic colleagues continue to claim that their obstruction is justified because two Republican Senators placed holds on some U.S. attorneys in the last administration.

This compares apples with oranges. One of the Senators relented on his hold and allowed U.S. attorneys to be confirmed by voice vote. The other Senator ultimately blocked five U.S. attorneys. A handful of U.S. attorneys being held last Congress, which I opposed, isn't comparable to the blanket hold on all 93 U.S. attorneys that we are facing today. The strategy this Congress is orchestrated by Senate Democratic leadership and is part of a broader, Senate-wide assault on the functioning of the executive branch.

At the end of the day, we can just look at the numbers. During the Biden administration, nearly 94 percent of his U.S. attorney nominees were confirmed by voice vote. So far in the second Trump administration, zero percent of his U.S. attorney nominees have been confirmed by voice vote.

For months, I have repeatedly tried to engage my Democratic colleagues to end their obstruction. I have warned that their tactics ultimately hurt the American people and will lead to lasting damage to the Senate as an institution. I have even offered a compromise where we hold five rollcall votes to compensate for the five nominees returned to the President at the end of March. To my great disappointment, my colleagues haven't relented from

their strategy, and I hope they will relent today with my unanimous consent requests.

I mentioned last week that one of the U.S. attorneys being held up is Daniel Rosen, nominated for the District of Minnesota. Mr. Rosen was reported out of committee by voice vote. He is supported by his home State Senators KLOBUCHAR and SMITH, both Democrats. He is a qualified nominee. He should be responding to the horrific mass shooting of children at the Annunciation Catholic Church but instead is languishing here on the Senate floor as a pawn of partisan obstruction.

This needs to end, and it needs to end today. So I now will ask unanimous consent to confirm 10 U.S. attorneys who have been reported out of committee. I hope that my Democratic colleagues will allow these nominees to get to work. Debate and disagreement about policy is to be expected but should never be at the expense of public safety.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following nominations en bloc: No. 176, David Charles Waterman, Iowa; No. 183, Ronald A. Parsons, South Dakota; No. 257, David Metcalf, Pennsylvania; No. 258, Bart McKay Davis, Idaho; No. 316, Kurt Alme of Montana; No. 317, Nicholas Chase, North Dakota; No. 318, Lesley Murphy, Nebraska; No. 319, Daniel Rosen, Minnesota; No. 320, Erik Siebert, Virginia; and No. 321, Kurt Wall, Louisiana; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The minority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, first, let the public know what they are talking about as obstruction: 2 hours of debate and a vote on some of the worst nominees we have ever seen. They want to pile them all together. Some of these nominees are—the people who know them in their States are appalled that they would be nominated.

Trump has chosen his U.S. attorneys for one reason only: blind obedience to him. That is it. No rule of law. No independence.

So of course our friends are afraid of 2 hours of debate and a vote because so many of these nominees are so bad. Historical bad nominees deserve a historical response.

So we wanted to come to an agreement with our colleagues to let some of the better ones through, but we couldn't—not because of our Senate colleagues. Senator GRASSLEY was involved, and Senator THUNE was involved. We were close to an agreement, and what happened? Donald Trump, who wants these horrible nominees—so many of them—said:

Go to hell.

That is what he said. So instead of our Republican colleagues telling Donald Trump “No, we can work out an agreement that is fair,” they said “OK.” They pedaled back.

Now what is their alternative? They are ready to detonate Senate precedent altogether and go nuclear on all the nominees. So much for oversight. And before they even do that, now they want to rubberstamp another round of nominees—no scrutiny, no debate.

Two hours of debate and a vote for someone as powerful as a U.S. attorney. Most Americans would agree that is the least we could do—the least we could do. So no scrutiny, no debate, and no consent from us.

I want to be very clear. If my colleague from Iowa, who is a good man, wants to resume our negotiations, which we were ready to do—and he knows it. He was part of it. If he is willing to back off threats to go nuclear, we will be open to having a conversation about a nominees package, including the ones on his list. We will be open to negotiations, just as we were at the end of July when we were in that room right across the hall from here and ready to have an agreement, when all of a sudden, Donald Trump says “Go to hell” and the Republican leadership says “OK. We won’t do it because he doesn’t like it” even though he has historically bad, reprehensible nominees.

So if Republicans are dead set on going nuclear, we will not grant consent today.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Well, obviously, I am disappointed that my request has been objected to. I had hoped today we could set a new direction and put the interests of the American people over partisanship.

I want to offer to the Democratic leader an offer he shouldn’t object to because it has both Republican and Democrat support. If we can’t agree to allow 10 U.S. attorneys who have been reported out of committee to be confirmed today, I am going to make a more modest request.

David Waterman is my pick to be U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Iowa—highly qualified. He was reported out of committee by voice vote, no recorded objections. My State needs him to get to work.

I initially recommended him to President Biden during the last administration, and he was nominated and reported out of committee last Congress.

My Democratic colleagues have tried to justify their obstruction by pointing to the hold by then-Senator VANCE last Congress. Well, Mr. Waterman was one of the five U.S. attorneys returned to the President from that hold.

So are we going to confirm a nominee who has been submitted to the Senate by two different Presidents and re-

ported out of committee twice—seems to me like something the Democrats should not object to—or are my Democratic colleague going to continue the objection?

Now, here is another one. They have confidence, surely, in their two Democratic Senators from Minnesota. I have already spoken about Daniel Rosen. Like Mr. Waterman, Mr. Rosen is well qualified to serve as U.S. attorney for the District of Minnesota. He, too, was reported out of committee by voice vote, and he is supported by both home State Senators KLOBUCHAR and SMITH. So I encourage my Democratic colleagues to send a clear signal to the people of Minnesota that they think they ought to have a law enforcement person at their side.

The District of Minnesota needs its top Federal prosecutor in place to preserve law and order, so we need to confirm Mr. Rosen. So I am now going to ask unanimous consent to confirm Mr. Waterman as U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Iowa and Mr. Rosen to be U.S. attorney for the District of Minnesota.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations en bloc: No. 176, David Charles Waterman, Iowa, and No. 319, David Rosen, Minnesota; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, I would with respect remind my colleague that all three of these people were on our list that we were negotiating and could have been passed with our agreement.

Donald Trump said:

Go to hell.

You and the Republican leader backed off. So you could have it done with an agreement, a bipartisan agreement—not a partisan agreement where the Republicans just choose whoever they want, no matter.

So the bottom line, once again, is simple: You want to get these things done? Negotiate an agreement in a bipartisan way. Don’t bow down to Donald Trump, who, as I said, has nominated for U.S. attorney in many other places some of the worst nominees, the most conflicted nominees, the least qualified nominees we have ever seen.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. You can see the weakness of that objection because here is somebody that has been nominated by President Biden and President Trump, and you have two Democratic Senators supporting him. At least in those 2 instances, out of 93 that are potentially on hold, they could go do their jobs.

I want to make one final request before I yield the floor. The Senate Judiciary Committee—in that committee, it is common practice to report certain nominees by voice vote. We have been doing it for decades—particularly for noncontroversial U.S. attorneys and U.S. marshal nominees. Under my chairmanship, we only conduct voice votes with explicit consent of the ranking member, and we don’t do them if there are any objections to so doing.

Recently, I have heard concern that nominees reported out of committee by voice vote may be challenged or face additional obstruction on the floor to further derail the functioning of the executive branch. I sincerely hope this isn’t the case.

Voice votes are a longstanding practice of our committee and involve complete cooperation between the majority and minority parties on the committee.

On the Senate Judiciary Committee, despite our differences, the ranking member and I have a good working relationship. When we reach a bipartisan agreement about how to manage our committee consistent with our norms, I hope that every Member of this body will respect this agreement.

So this is my unanimous consent request: I ask unanimous consent that no point of order lie with respect to the following U.S. attorney nominees reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee by voice vote pursuant to explicit agreement between the offices of the chairman and ranking member, whether those nominations are offered individually or pursuant to a resolution: David Charles Waterman, Ronald A. Parsons, David Metcalf, Bart McKay Davis, Kurt Alme, Nicholas Chase, Lesley Murphy, Daniel Rosen, Erik Siebert, and Kurt Wall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, once again, negotiate in a fair, bipartisan way with us, and many of these things could be resolved. Do it in a partisan way. Bow down to Donald Trump—no way.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2026

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, we are living in a time of growing global unrest. China is accelerating its military buildup in the Indo-Pacific. While I remain hopeful that President Trump can help broker peace between Presidents Putin and Zelenskyy, Russia’s brutal war against Ukraine grinds on. That is why it is more important than ever that we invest in our servicemembers, protect defense spectrum, drive innovation, and strengthen our missile defense systems.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am proud to report that this year’s National Defense