

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

restrictive voting provisions we have seen since that Supreme Court decision in *States like Georgia and Texas*.

In 2021, the Supreme Court weakened another critical section of the Voting Rights Act with a decision in a case known as *Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee*, making it more difficult for plaintiffs to prevail in lawsuits against discriminatory voting laws, decisions, or procedures.

With these rulings, the Supreme Court has fueled State-led efforts to suppress voters, particularly voters of color.

Justice Elena Kagan wrote in her dissent to the *Brnovich* decision that “in the last decade, this Court has treated no statute worse” than the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

This year’s Presidential election will be the first general election since a wave of restrictive voting laws were passed in the aftermath of the 2020 election.

Mr. President, did you ever take a look at the videos and reporting of people standing in line and waiting to vote?

Did you ever notice, coincidentally, how many people standing in line are people of color? There always seems to be a lack of voting spaces for people of color when it comes to voting. Why is that? Well, I don’t think it is an accident. I think it is a conscious decision. And before the Holder decision—the *Shelby County v. Holder* decision—there was a requirement for preclearance for the practices that lead to that.

Voters in 27 States, more than half the country, will face restrictions on the right to vote they have never faced before because of the Supreme Court decision. Last year alone, State legislators in 14 States enacted 17 laws that made it harder for people—particularly people of color—to vote. As Members of Congress, we must defend our democracy from these coordinated attacks on the fundamental right we have as Americans.

Last week, a group of my colleagues and I reintroduced a bill bearing the name of John Lewis, whom I mentioned before, that would preserve and protect the rights of voters in America. This legislation will restore and strengthen the Voting Rights Act. This bill honors the legacy of John Lewis and countless other Americans who have fought and some have died for the right to vote.

Last Congress, we tried to bring this legislation to the floor for a debate and a vote, but our Republican colleagues blocked it with a filibuster. This bill should unite Senators across the aisle, not divide us. In 2006, 98 Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act, with no votes in opposition. In 2006—not that long ago—98 Senators voted to reauthorize this bill. At the time, Senator McConnell, who just spoke on the floor, said that “this is a good piece of legislation that has served an important purpose over many, many years.”

That was the bipartisan support that greeted that bill in 2006. Yet, today, Senate Republicans have no interest in reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act to protect voters from efforts to suppress the right to vote.

Next week, the Senate Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing to examine the continued need to restore and expand the protections of the Voting Rights Act. This hearing is an important step, but we desperately need legislation, not just a hearing. Every year that goes by without passing this critical law leaves voters vulnerable—particularly voters of color. That is why I am calling on my colleagues to join me in supporting the John Lewis Voting Rights Act.

Congress has the power to restore voting rights, and we should do it because as John Lewis reminded us, “Democracy is not a state. It is an act, and each generation must do its part to help build what we call the Beloved Community, a nation and world society at peace with itself.”

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO HAL MALCHOW

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the incredible life of a dear friend and a great American, Hal Malchow, someone whom I think many of my colleagues on the Democratic side have known.

I first met Hal in 1985. I was visiting my dear friend from law school, Rob McDuff, in Oxford, MS. Hal and I were pretty young back in those days, both interested in politics, and the two of us really hit it off at a party that Rob hosted.

Now, Hal has long enjoyed a successful career as one of the country’s premier political consultants, but before that, he went to Millsaps College and then the McGeorge School of Law in California. He did practice law for a bit in Jackson, MS. But Hal’s real passion was never the law; it was always politics.

In fact, when young, aspiring lawyers would come to his office to get advice about following him into law, Hal was known to reach into his big, impressive wooden desk and pull out his latest rental car contract with Hertz.

“See that contract?” he would ask the enterprising, would-be attorney, slapping it face down on the table. “You go to law school, you are going to spend the rest of your career writing those kind of deals.”

So after a few years as a bond attorney in Mississippi, Hal turned his attention to politics. He took on three different candidates as a campaign manager and managed to lose all three races.

Undaunted, in 1984, Hal took on a new challenge. There was an up-and-coming young Congressman from Tennessee with a pretty good resume and a well-known family name who was thinking about running for the Senate. And despite his rather unimpressive

track record so far, Hal managed to get an interview.

“So,” Al Gore said to him, “I’ve got one question for you, Hal. If I hire you to be my campaign manager, how am I supposed to explain it to my supporters?”

The way Hal tells it, he looked Gore in the eye and said, “Everyone in Tennessee thinks you’re a lock for this seat. But you can tell them you’re taking nothing for granted because you hired the hungriest SOB in the country to run your race.”

Needless to say, Hal got the job, and Al Gore went on to the Senate that year. Soon, Hal moved to DC. Starting at his kitchen table in a small, one-room apartment, he managed to build the Nation’s largest voter contact firm, pioneering the use of advanced data analytics to revolutionize political targeting, launching experiments to measure and improve campaign tactics, and revolutionizing direct mail and fundraising.

He brought the notion of the “moneyball” approach to politics a decade before anybody else was doing it. That will be one of Hal’s greatest legacies to the Democratic Party and to American politics: the idea that spending decisions should actually be driven by data. He wanted to hold campaign consultants like himself accountable for being wise stewards of donor dollars. He measured success in effectiveness, hard proof that spending motivated voters one way or the other.

Hal worked on every one of my campaigns; and at one point or another, I suspect that Hal has worked with at least half of my colleagues on the Democratic side. But Hal was more than just a consultant; he is also my friend. I know him not only for his brilliant, strategic mind but as someone who is honest, loyal, and extraordinarily creative. My wife Lisa and I have looked forward to receiving his hilarious Christmas cards. He would create a different message and a different approach every holiday season.

In addition to writing a series of political books on moving and motivating voters, Hal is also an accomplished fiction writer. His writing career began when his then-8-year-old son approached him with an idea. Two years later, they completed the first draft of “The Sword of Darrow,” a highly acclaimed young-adult fantasy novel. In 2014, writing alone, he published a sequel, “The Dragon and the Firefly,” before penning two political thrillers, including “42 Million to One,” a finalist for a number of international and national book awards.

As that story illustrates, Hal is also a devoted father to his son, Alex. For many years, he served on the board of trustees at Alex’s alma mater, the Lab School. After his son was diagnosed with dyslexia, Hal dove into the challenges facing other children like Alex, eventually becoming the president of the International Dyslexia Association.

Hal is also the biggest Cheesehead I know. Hal was very proud of the fact—