

that we love together, and we promise to stand by one another. This is about standing by one another. This is about seeking that justice that President Lincoln spoke about so many Marches ago. And now, on this March day in the year 2024, the U.S. Senate has the opportunity to do its part—its small part—to continue to make this Nation what it could be, what we promised it will be, and to put right things that have been wrong.

I will end with this, Madam President. As we speak, the government is testing under the homes in St. Louis—under people's basements in St. Louis—for radioactive contamination. After saying for decades there was no contamination to be concerned about, there was nothing we should worry about, now they are testing in our homes. They have already shut down schools. The water in the creeks is contaminated. Landfills are contaminated. The soil has been contaminated. Today, we say: Enough. Today, we turn the page. Today, we begin something new.

For those folks who are watching now from Missouri, whether from their living rooms while their homes are being tested or high schools while hoping for something better, let's see the U.S. Senate at work. Let's see what we can do to keep the promises we have made to each other as Americans.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON S. 3853

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. HAWLEY. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT).

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Graham	Ossoff
Blackburn	Hagerty	Padilla
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Hawley	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Braun	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Butler	Kaine	Rubio
Cantwell	Kelly	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schatz
Casey	Klobuchar	Schmitt
Coons	Lujan	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Markey	Shaheen
Cotton	Marshall	Sinema
Crapo	McConnell	Smith
Cruz	Menendez	Stabenow
Daines	Merkley	Sullivan
Duckworth	Moran	Tester
Durbin	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Fetterman	Murphy	Vance

Warner
Warnock

Warren
Welch

Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—30

Barrasso
Budd
Capito
Carper
Cassidy
Collins
Cornyn
Cramer
Ernst
Fischer

Grassley
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee
Lummis
Manchin
Mullin

Paul
Ricketts
Romney
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Thune
Tillis
Tuberville
Wicker
Young

Graham
Grassley
Hagerty
Hawley
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee

Lummis
McConnell
Moran
Mullin
Paul
Ricketts
Risch
Romney
Rounds
Rubio

Schmitt
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Tuberville
Vance
Wicker
Young

NOT VOTING—4

Britt
Gillibrand

Marshall
Sanders

NOT VOTING—1

Britt

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 30.

Under the previous order, the 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill is passed.

The bill (S. 3853) was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session.

VOTE ON NOTI NOMINATION

All postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Noti nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 76 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Butler
Cantwell
Cardin
Casey
Carpenter
Collins
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Fetterman
Hassan

Heinrich
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
King
Klobuchar
Lujan
Manchin
Markley
Menendez
Merkley
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla

Peters
Reed
Rosen
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—45

Barrasso
Blackburn
Boozman
Braun
Budd

Capito
Cassidy
Cornyn
Cotton
Cramer

Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Ernst
Fischer

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FETTERMAN). 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 Senator from Florida.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT of Florida pertaining to the introduction of S. Res. 580 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

NOMINATION OF ADEEL A. MANGI

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an extraordinary responsibility as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee—important legislation and, probably more important, the filling of vacancies in our Federal judiciary.

Under article III of our Constitution, we create judges, and there are approximately 890 of these Federal judges across the United States. As vacancies occur, as they often do, the Senate Judiciary Committee, working with the White House and Members of the Senate, has to do background checks on these individuals, submit them to the FBI for further background checks, do our own due diligence, consider them in an open hearing before the committee, and ultimately vote in committee before they come to the floor for advice and consent.

So far this year—I should say in this term—under President Biden, we have had 181 Federal judges who have gone through this process—been cleared on the floor, reported out of the Senate—and are now serving their Nation in this capacity.

I can tell you that it is not an easy process. Lengthy questionnaires are given to each nominee to identify so many details of their lives, I find it hard to believe they kept track and record of it, but they did. Then, of course, Agencies call to verify the contents and answers in those questionnaires. Then they go through close scrutiny by the staff of the Judiciary Committee on both sides, Democrats and Republicans. Then comes the day of reckoning when they have their hearing in a public setting. Many of these nominees are questioned extensively by members of the committee. I will tell you, politics ain't beanbag, and when it comes to the questions asked of judicial nominees, it is a serious process.

We have gone through more than 200 under the Biden administration in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Some of them have had a tough time of it, many of them had an easy time of it, but they all go through the same process.

One of the most important accomplishments of this administration has been the confirmation of highly qualified, I believe evenhanded judges to the Federal bench.

As I mentioned, to date, we have confirmed 181 lifetime judges, including a number of firsts—the first Black woman and public defender on the Supreme Court of the United States, the first Muslim-American judge on a district court, the first Asian-American judge on the Seventh Circuit. We should add another first to that list—Adeel Mangi to the Third Circuit.

Mr. Mangi is a highly qualified nominee with incredible credentials and more than two decades of litigation experience. He would be the first Muslim American to ever serve on a Federal appellate court.

Nevertheless, he is going through scrutiny unlike anything I have ever seen. He has been criticized and questioned in a way that I have never seen before in the committee. Unfortunately, many of the questions that have been raised about Mr. Mangi and his background have created suspicions in people's minds that his religion is the reason for the questioning.

Treatment of this highly qualified nominee has sometimes reached an all-time low. At the hearing in December, committee Republicans subjected Mr. Mangi to combative lines of questioning about the Israel-Hamas war. This is a man who is seeking to serve on a Federal bench in appellate court. The questions that are asked of him were more appropriately asked of the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense.

At one point, a Republican Senator asked this Muslim American the following question: Do you celebrate the anniversary of 9/11 in your home? Think about that for a second. Because he is Muslim, this Senator thought it was appropriate to ask him whether he celebrated 9/11 in his home. He, of course, said no. He was a resident of New York and thought it was a tragedy that occurred in our Nation, and he had friends and family who were affected by that tragedy.

During his hearing, under oath, Mr. Mangi unequivocally condemned anti-Semitism in all forms and condemned any acts of terrorism no fewer than 10 times. Think of that. Because he is a Muslim American, he was asked 10 different times whether he was anti-Semitic. He, of course, said no on each occasion. He also repeatedly denounced any form of hatred or bigotry in his answers to written questions.

Any insinuation that Mr. Mangi is anti-Semitic is rooted in prejudice that has no place in our country, and claims that were made are false. As he ex-

plained, "I have [] worked extensively to advance religious liberty, which I consider to be a fundamental American value, and to combat religious bigotry against any religious group. I have been proud to represent a unique and massive coalition that I built over many years involving major Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Sikh, and other religious groups on matters of common interest."

Mr. Mangi has also been unfairly attacked for his nominal affiliation with the Alliance of Families for Justice. Critics have falsely claimed that because of his minimal involvement with this organization, he has somehow associated himself with violent criminals and supports "cop killers." That charge was made on the floor of the Senate against Mr. Mangi.

Nothing could be further from the truth. As a longtime corporate lawyer, Mr. Mangi has never said or written anything—anything—that suggests he supports individuals who have murdered members of law enforcement. He has never—never—represented or otherwise provided legal counsel to anyone accused of killing a police officer.

During the Trump administration, Republicans voted unanimously to confirm two judges who had personally represented individuals who had killed police officers.

Let me add quickly that everyone in America has the right to counsel. The crimes they may be charged with could be horrendous, but they still have the right to legal representation.

But to think that they would accuse Mr. Mangi of somehow supporting cop killers when he has never been involved with a client charged with that crime—the treatment of Mr. Mangi by some Republicans puts their hypocrisy on full display. There cannot be one standard for Republican appointees and another for Democratic appointees.

Mr. Mangi is eminently qualified. He is a graduate of Oxford and Harvard Law School. He spent more than two decades in private practice at a pre-eminent law firm, focusing on complex commercial litigation. He has served as counsel of record in more than 30 matters before Federal appellate courts, as well as eight amicus briefs submitted to the Supreme Court.

Throughout his career, Mr. Mangi has also demonstrated a deep commitment to pro bono work. In fact, he has devoted more than 4,000 hours to representing clients in religious discrimination, employment discrimination, and asylum cases.

Given Mr. Mangi's record, he has earned the support of a wide range of organizations, including organizations representing more than 1 million Jewish Americans.

Listen to what the National Council of Jewish Women had to say about Mr. Mangi:

He is highly qualified to serve on this court, bringing a wealth of professional and personal experience in addition to extraordinary legal qualifications.

Yet some of the Republican Senators on the committee suggested he was anti-Semitic, prejudiced against Jewish people. This endorsement by the National Council of Jewish Women clearly says otherwise.

Following Mr. Mangi's hearing, the Anti-Defamation League, an organization which is dedicated to rooting out prejudice against Jewish people, sent a statement to the committee, unsolicited by me, in which they said:

Berating the first American Muslim federal appellate judicial nominee with endless questions that appear to have been motivated by bias towards his religion is profoundly wrong.

Mr. Mangi also has the support of a number of law enforcement organizations, from the New Jersey chapter of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives to the Hispanic American Law Enforcement Association.

Mr. Mangi stated:

I am ready and prepared to be held accountable for any statement that I have ever made, any word that I have ever written, or any action that I have ever taken.

He went on to say:

I am not and should not be held accountable for statements made by people I do not know at events that I was not involved in.

Mr. Mangi is right. He should be judged based on his record, not on dishonest, bad-faith insinuations.

I urge my colleagues to dismiss the smear campaign against Mr. Mangi and support his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the chair of the Judiciary Committee about the nominee. Everything he said is true. I share his horror at the vilification of him, which I do believe is based on his faith, and he would be an outstanding member of the Federal court.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your defense on behalf of an excellent nominee.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. President, I am here to talk about the post office and the frustration we are having in Vermont with the management of the post office, starting with Mr. DeJoy, our Postmaster General, and his total disregard for what is happening to our postal service in Vermont.

Let me start by saying what the specific incident is that is just baffling to Senator SANDERS, to Congressman BALINT, to Governor Scott, and to me. We had a flood in July. The postal building in Montpelier was flooded and damaged, and it is not going to be opened for years. We have to get another location for our post office. That was July. It is March now. We have no new postal service, no new postal building.

The workers, whom we are absolutely indebted to, the postal workers—they