

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

Authorization Act meets this moment. It includes key provisions I secured to modernize our nuclear deterrent and strengthen our national defense.

As chair of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, I fought to upgrade the National Nuclear Security Administration's infrastructure. The bill establishes an annual independent assessment of NNSA's progress toward modernization goals, ensuring our nuclear deterrent remains both effective and up to date.

It requires the deployment of at least 400 intercontinental ballistic missiles across no fewer than 450 launch facilities, maintaining a force structure capable of deterring any nuclear-capable adversary.

It authorizes more than \$4 billion for the Sentinel Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Program, and it requires that it be fielded no later than September 30, 2033.

It accelerates the sea-launched nuclear cruise missile program. And it expands experimentation and prototyping authority to all combatant commands, including U.S. Strategic Command at Offutt Air Force Base in my home State of Nebraska.

This is exactly the kind of strategic deterrence that makes our adversaries think twice and say: Not today.

This year's NDAA also safeguards critical defense spectrum. Some in Washington have suggested that the Pentagon is sitting on spectrum bands that could be better used for commercial wireless. That portrayal is both inaccurate, and it is dangerous. The reality is these frequencies are not idle. They are the backbone of America's missile defense and intelligence systems. And we should not be allowing Federal Agencies to sell critical communication channels needed to carry out the Trump administration's priorities, including the Golden Dome missile defense shield. That is why this year's defense bill prohibits any modifications to defense systems in these spectrums bands unless top Pentagon leaders themselves deem it absolutely necessary.

Earlier this summer, I led the effort to secure—for the first time in law—a carve-out that prevents the Federal Communications Commission from auctioning or reallocating these bands for the next decade. The NDAA provision is consistent with these protections, ensuring that we strike the right balance: unleashing America's wireless innovation, while never compromising our national security.

We are also preparing for the threats that we cannot yet see. I secured provisions to assess the readiness of the National Disaster Medical System, to modernize our roadmaps for cloud migration and artificial intelligence, and to ensure that our intelligence community has the meteorological and environmental services that it needs.

But all of these priorities mean little without investing in the brave men and women who carry them out. That is

why I fought to authorize \$19 million above the President's budget request to help recover and identify the remains of our fallen servicemembers from past wars and conflicts. The U.S. military leaves no one behind.

And through this bill, we are directing the Pentagon to explore whether local communities can play a more active role in helping develop the Department's healthcare facilities, similar to my CHIP IN for Veterans Act. This is the very least we can do for the troops and the families who have sacrificed so much for the freedoms that we hold dear.

Beyond the details, we must keep sight of the bigger picture. Our adversaries—nations that hate America—well, they are sharing weapons and resources and a common goal. They want to weaken American power and dismantle our influence across the globe.

The character of war has evolved rapidly. Breakthroughs in artificial intelligence, unmanned systems, hypersonic weapons, next-generation aircraft, and space-based capabilities, they are all reshaping the battlefield. At the same time, we live in a political environment that is too often partisan and divided.

Yet on this issue, I believe most of my colleagues agree that we must confront these threats head-on, and that means rebuilding the arsenal of democracy.

To do so, we need serious reform at the Pentagon. This year's NDAA delivers: modernizing the budget process, cutting redtape, improving efficiency, and unleashing innovation. This is not partisan. This is not political. This is necessity.

Our servicemembers must have the resources they need to carry out their missions and return home to their loved ones. This bill strengthens our military, and it sends a very clear message: America is prepared to meet the moment.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it without delay.

NOMINATION OF EDWARD L. ARTAU

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote to confirm Edward L. Artau to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

I will vote in opposition to Judge Artau's confirmation to a lifetime appointment on the Federal bench. There are several reasons why I cannot support his nomination. Based on Judge Artau's record, I do not believe that he will be a neutral arbiter on the Federal bench. In a case involving President Trump's lawsuit against the individual members of the Pulitzer Prize Board for defamation and conspiracy, Judge Artau went beyond ruling on the jurisdictional question at issue. In Judge Artau's concurring opinion, he took it upon himself to zealously make the President's case, opening and closing his opinion echoing the President's own words, "FAKE NEWS."

The partisan tone of Judge Artau's writing and his zealous advocacy of

President Trump's case from the bench leaves the public with no question about his political preferences and raises concerns about his ability to be a neutral arbiter of the law. At a time when this administration's actions are being challenged in courtrooms across the country, it is critical to confirm judges who can assess the merits of each case without favor to any litigant. Judge Artau's concurring opinion makes clear that he would not be able to do this.

I am also troubled by the timing of his nomination and this highly partisan opinion. Judge Artau had been in contact with Senator SCOTT's office about his interest in filling a judicial vacancy in November 2024, a month before he was assigned to this case.

Despite actively seeking President Trump's nomination, Judge Artau claimed that he did not need to recuse himself or inform the parties in the litigation.

Two days after Judge Artau proved his allegiance to President Trump with his opinion, Judge Artau was advised his name would be recommended to the White House. Eight days after the opinion was issued, Judge Artau was contacted by the White House for an interview.

It is hard to believe that the hyperpartisan tone of Judge Artau's opinion and the timing of his nomination is just a coincidence.

I cannot support Judge Artau's nomination and urge my colleagues to reject this overt attempt to install another MAGA loyalist to the bench.

VOTE ON ARTAU NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Artau nomination?

Mr. CURTIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 504 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Banks	Cassidy	Curtis
Barrasso	Collins	Daines
Blackburn	Cornyn	Ernst
Boozman	Cotton	Fischer
Britt	Cramer	Graham
Budd	Crapo	Grassley
Capito	Cruz	Hagerty