

That is why this historic announcement of an over-the-counter birth control pill is so important. It lands a blow against those who are trying so desperately to limit access to reproductive care.

Democrats, meanwhile, will continue fighting to make sure everyone who needs birth control can get it and to improve women's healthcare, women's access to healthcare, and the affordability of healthcare.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ronald T. Keohane, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would note that that is Buffalo, NY, of which we are proud.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 506.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adrienne Jennings Noti, of the District of Columbia, to be an As-

sociate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 506, Adrienne Jennings Noti, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Charles E. Schumer, Gary C. Peters, Tim Kaine, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jeanne Shaheen, Tammy Duckworth, Tina Smith, Christopher A. Coons, Chris Van Hollen, Mark R. Warner, Amy Klobuchar, Elizabeth Warren, Alex Padilla, Brian Schatz, Mark Kelly.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, March 5, be waived.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last week, Congress avoided a harmful and unnecessary government shutdown, and, this week, we will take a major step forward on one of our most basic responsibilities of government.

Our colleagues, Senator COLLINS and Senator MURRAY, have been working hard on the fiscal year 2024 appropriations for the better part of a year. The Appropriations Committee advanced the bills we will consider this week back in June and July of last year, working in good faith through the regular order. And in all but one case, they received unanimous support.

This first tranche of annual appropriations accounts for a serious portion of our overall discretionary funding responsibilities, and thanks to Senator COLLINS' leadership, the bills the Appropriations Committee cleared last summer secured important Republican priorities up front.

By all reasonable measures, the conference with our House colleagues has made the legislation we will take up this week even stronger.

The Senate has an opportunity to strengthen protections for America's farmland by tightening oversight over foreign agricultural transactions and expand support for farmers, ranchers, and rural communities. We have a chance to strengthen protections for U.S. intellectual property and surge resources to State and local law enforcement agencies on the frontlines of the fight to curb violent crime and to bring theentanyl crisis under control.

We can increase support for VA rural health and opioid treatment, protect the Second Amendment rights of America's veterans, and improve housing and facilities for Active-Duty servicemembers and their families, including thousands of Kentuckians stationed in harm's way.

We can fund urgent transportation and water infrastructure projects, support domestic enrichment of critical minerals, and invest in the long-term safety, security, and superiority of our nuclear arsenal.

We can do it all this week.

I am grateful to our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for pushing sensible annual funding legislation one step closer to the President's desk, and I would certainly urge all of our colleagues to support it.

NOMINATION OF ADEEL ABDULLAH MANGI

Mr. President, on another matter, I have spoken repeatedly about President Biden's attempt to give life tenure on the Federal bench to an activist tied to an extremist group that unabashedly celebrates terrorism. I have already made absolutely clear that the Senate should not—should not—confirm the nomination of Adeel Mangi to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

But Mr. Mangi's alarming record doesn't stop at ties to terrorist sympathizers; it turns out he also has a history of support for anti-police activism. In fact, he serves on the advisory board of a group of apologists for convicted cop killers. The so-called Alliance of Families for Justice, AFJ, was founded in part by a woman who actually pled guilty to the murder of a police officer and whose name has graced a fellowship they fund. With Mr. Mangi on their advisory board, the AFJ celebrated her and other cop killers as—listen to this—"freedom fighters." Take, for example, the executive director of AFJ. She was counsel of record on a brief to spring from prison a notorious cop killer whom she later compared favorably to Che Guevara.

Honoring criminals and punishing law enforcement is the exact opposite of justice. One county police association in New York highlighted this irony by pointing out that "Mr. Mangi's heroes executed our heroes who were protecting and serving the community."

Naturally, law enforcement associations across the country share this concern. They are concerned that a nominee who would be responsible for interpreting and upholding our laws is willing to make common cause with an

organization that excuses the most heinous form of lawbreaking. Overwhelmingly, the thin blue line is worried that Mr. Mangi's inability to distinguish between criminals and heroes renders him incapable of administering justice.

As the National Association of Police Organizations put it, "It is one thing to stand up for the rights of those shunned or mistreated by society. It is a far different thing to exalt unrepentant killers who were convicted following legal trials in courts of law. Mr. Mangi is smart enough to know the difference, and [he] has made his choice."

The National Sheriffs' Association said that Mangi's connection with AFJ "raises concerns about a potential bias against victims and law enforcement, which could impact his decision-making as a lifetime appointed judge."

A State law enforcement group in New Jersey put it this way:

We can respect a lawyer who represents criminal defendants to the best of their ability. But we can't respect, and can never support, a lawyer who so blatantly promotes the opinion that the police are criminals, and the cop-killers are the victims. He has disqualified himself as an impartial decider of facts where police are involved.

As far away as Arizona, the Phoenix Law Enforcement Association wrote:

Mr. Mangi's conscious work with [the AFJ] shows an anti-victim and anti-police bias that would certainly cloud his decision making as a judge.

Now, it is worth noting here who is not involved. Even as law enforcement officers nationwide organize to sound the alarm, the country's largest police union has yet to weigh in. Each day, police work gets more dangerous thanks to the work of anti-cop activists like AFJ, but a member of their advisory board gets nominated to a Federal appeals court, and so far, it is silence—silence—from the Fraternal Order of Police.

Well, I hope that changes soon. The last thing our country needs right now is another Federal judge who thinks criminals are the real victims—especially ones with the blood of police on their hands.

American communities have been suffering for years under a coordinated leftwing campaign to coddle criminals and neuter our criminal justice system. District attorneys in deep-blue cities have put politics over prosecution and turned repeat violent offenders loose in their streets, and the Biden administration continues to encourage this sort of bad behavior.

It is time to acknowledge who are the criminals and who are the heroes, and it is certainly time to refuse a lifetime appointment to the judiciary to anyone who cannot tell the difference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have a statement I am going to make on the Voting Rights Act, which I think is apropos as we are considering Super Tuesday and the millions of Americans who will participate. But first I would

like to address the comments that were just made by the Republican Senate leader.

Mr. President, you are a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and you were there the day Adeel Mangi's nomination came before our committee. It is a unique nomination. It has never happened before—never in the history of the United States—because Mr. Mangi is a Muslim American, and he is being nominated to serve on the second highest court in the land.

When you read his biography—and I don't have it before me; I am going to come back when I do have all the information before me—you cannot help but believe that this is an extraordinary individual and an extraordinary lawyer who is seeking this spot.

The treatment he received in the Senate Judiciary Committee—you will remember it as well as I will—because he was a Muslim American was outrageous—outrageous. They believe that he must be a terrorist because he is Muslim, and it was suggested by a number of Senators questioning him that he has links with terrorism. In fact, one Republican Senator went so far as to ask him on the record: Do you celebrate 9/11 in your home? Do you celebrate 9/11 in your home?

He said: Of course not. It was a horrible thing. I condemn all forms of violence and terrorism, he said, and those people—many who died—were from the same community I was in in the States of New York and New Jersey.

Then there was a suggestion that because he was a Muslim American, he must be anti-Semitic. I can't tell you how many different times that was asked of him, and he condemned anti-Semitism on a wholesale basis, with no qualifications and no equivocation.

The questioning in that area was so outrageous against this individual, this Muslim American, so outrageous that the Anti-Defamation League, a national organization, highly respected, that stands up for Jewish Americans and their rights and speaks out without hesitation when people are being critical and prejudicial to Jewish Americans, sent us on the Senate Judiciary Committee—unsolicited—a response to the questioning he faced. I read it into the record at the committee meeting.

Mr. President, I want to tell you, politics is a beanbag, and I know that if you are seeking a lifetime appointment to the bench, you better be prepared to answer a lot of questions. Some of them will be fair, and some won't be fair, but be ready—it is going to happen. But what happened to Mr. Mangi in that committee was beyond anything acceptable by Senate standards, and it continues to this day.

To argue that he somehow is a cop killer—my God. What more are they going to throw at this man? I am going to come before the Senate on another day—maybe even tomorrow, if I can do it—and tell the whole story about his nomination, but to listen to what was

just said about this man is breathtaking.

He is an extraordinary individual. He is overqualified for the job, if there is such a thing. He has certainly served his country and wants to do more. The fact that he is a Muslim American should not subject him to this type of a beating in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, and I will return to address that issue specifically at a later date.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Mr. President, it is Super Tuesday. Millions of Americans will vote in primaries in 16 different States. It is a day for Americans from all walks of life to express their political opinion and vote for the candidate they deem best suited for the highest office in the land.

As Americans, our most fundamental right is the right to vote. My dear friend and colleague, the late Congressman John Lewis, called voting "the most powerful nonviolent tool we have to create a more perfect union."

At our last Presidential election, more than 158 million Americans cast a ballot—the largest voter turnout in the history of the United States. But that record doesn't tell the whole story. Over the weekend, the Brennan Center for Justice released a report on the growing racial disparities in voting in America. They found that "the racial turnout gap—or the difference in the turnout rate between white and nonwhite voters . . . has consistently grown since 2012 and is growing most quickly in parts of the country that were previously covered under Section 5 of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, which was suspended by the Supreme Court [of the United States] in its 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*."

So although record numbers of Americans are making their voices heard in elections, we are also witnessing an explosion of sinister efforts to discourage and silence many of these voices.

Unfortunately, efforts to suppress the right to vote in this country are nothing new. Congress took action in 1965 when the U.S. Senate voted 77 to 19 to pass the Voting Rights Act, finally outlawing State practices that had denied millions of Americans—especially Black Americans—the right to vote.

Over the next almost 50 years, the Voting Rights Act was reauthorized five times, always—always—by large, bipartisan majorities. Each new version expanded the promise and protection of the Voting Rights Act. The most recent was signed into law by Republican President George W. Bush in 2006.

That all changed in 2013. The Supreme Court struck a deadly blow on the Voting Rights Act in *Shelby County v. Holder*. Before the Court's ruling in *Shelby County*, the Voting Rights Act required localities with a track record of disenfranchising voters of color to seek Federal approval for any changes in their voting laws. This requirement is known as preclearance, and it could have blocked many of the