

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

are fantastic throughout the State of Vermont. They work under very difficult circumstances. They are understaffed, overworked, and they do everything they can to get the mail delivered.

So they are doing what they can, but they don't have a place for postal boxes. They don't have a place where they can sort the mail. They don't have a place—actually, Montpelier residences and businesses don't have a Postal Service they can come to, to pick up their mail. And it is going on and on and on. And despite the efforts of Governor Scott, who has made suggestions on where we could put a replacement location, despite the entreaties of Senator SANDERS and Congresswoman BALINT and me, we get literally no response, and that is the part that is so astonishing to me.

We try to get a meeting with Postmaster General DeJoy. We send letters, we make phone calls, and there is no response.

Montpelier, right now, has the distinction of being the only capital city in the country that doesn't have a post office. We don't have a McDonald's either. We are OK with that. But we are not OK with not having a post office where people can pick up their medications, their Social Security checks, where businesses can drop off their mail going out to customers.

And what is so aggravating to all of us is there is no response from the management. That is their job. They just blow us off.

And can you imagine what it is like if you are a citizen and you are trying to get some response on the basic right that you have to get your mail on time, the basic right and the confidence you should have that you will get your prescription medication on time, when, not only do they get ignored when they are making a reasonable request—hey, where is our post office?—the Members of Congress don't even get a response.

And, you know, for a while I thought: Maybe DeJoy doesn't like me. He doesn't like SANDERS. He doesn't like BALINT. Maybe he doesn't like our government.

But do you know what? That isn't what it is about. I wish it was personal. But what I am finding out from talking to my colleagues is that this problem of postal mismanagement and disregard—and disregard—for the legitimate concerns of our citizens is widespread.

So, for instance, in Tennessee, my colleague—my former colleague in the House, TIM BURCHETT, is trying to figure out how to get stuff delivered. His folks need medications. They need the checks—the Social Security checks. He tried to get the Postal Service to respond. I am talking, again, about the management, because Tim, like me, is really admiring of the work of the postal workers. They were concerned that he couldn't get a meeting.

Finally, the Postal Service sent some people a couple hundred miles to his

district. They sat there for 15 minutes and made no response whatsoever to the entreaties of the people who had asked for that meeting. And then they vanished—no response, no action.

My colleague Senator SMITH is in Minnesota. There is a rural post office there where people have been told to prioritize the delivery of Amazon packages—that is a private company having the Postal Service doing the last bit of work to get that package to the home—but to prioritize that for Amazon over the delivery of everyday mail for people who are citizens of that small town.

And then, in Colorado, small ski towns in Colorado are waiting weeks or months at a time to get their mail. The Wall Street Journal did a story about this, and I want to quote it.

A citizen there said: "Christmas cards began arriving in February. But what's not funny at all"—he was kind of philosophical about it—"is [that] driver's licenses, disability payments, election ballots, [and] prescriptions" were not arriving for months as well.

I mean, this is the United States of America. The Postal Service is older than the Constitution itself. The original infrastructure that we began building were roads to connect one postal service to another. That is what it was about, and it is getting wrecked.

And the wreckage by Postmaster General DeJoy is reflected in his unresponsive attitude toward everyday Americans in every district of this country, and it has got to end.

There is independence with the Postal Service. That is to avoid Congressional meddling. But do you know what? Is it Congressional meddling when we are sticking up for the businesses in our communities, for the senior citizens in our communities, for the kids who, in fact, do like getting cards from their grandfather and their grandmother? No. I don't think that is meddling. That is demanding service.

What is unacceptable is a postal management service that won't even pick up the phone and meet with Members of Congress on behalf of their citizens or, more importantly, get the job done on behalf of all of the people we represent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss with my colleagues the fact that Agencies of the Federal Government aren't very insightful to make sure that taxpayers' money is spent properly and also to say how they are not cooperating with the constitutional responsibility of Congress to make sure the money is spent in a legal way.

In this case, I am here to talk about the Environmental Protection Agency.

On April 13, I began an investigation into an EPA program called the Environmental Justice Collaborative Problem-Solving Cooperative Agreement

Program. Now that is quite a name, isn't it?

On February 22 of this year, I issued a preliminary report on my investigation. That EPA program dishes out millions of taxpayer dollars to left-leaning nonprofits. The funding is from President Biden's American Rescue Plan, which was opposed by Senate Republicans.

According to the EPA, the purpose of this environmental justice program is to address environmental and public health issues in underserved communities.

As part of that program, the EPA sent 34 individual nonprofits a combined \$4.3 million, with each receiving up to \$200,000.

I think the money was meant to be spent for the purpose of improving the environment—and I don't have any trouble with that—but I think you will see that the grantees didn't use the money for what it was intended for.

Now, I wrote to all 34 grantees because I wanted to know how they spent that taxpayer money. I wrote to the EPA because I wanted to know how it was conducting oversight of that spending. You see, it isn't only Congress that has a responsibility to see that the money is spent responsibly and according to Congress's will, but it is also up to these Agencies to make sure that they spend the money accordingly.

It is a pretty simple request. I want EPA to show their work, how the taxpayers' money is being spent. Well, this EPA, apparently, to them that question is just too much for them to handle.

So guess what happened after I sent the oversight letters. The EPA interfered and told these 34 grantees that they—meaning the EPA—would handle the Grassley request. This led many grantees to refuse compliance with any congressional oversight request and also obstruct my efforts of getting answers for the taxpayers.

Some grantees were so emboldened by EPA's obstructive conduct that they sent my staff emails. And this is just one example of the emails:

We report to EPA and they're responding on our behalf. You can make your request to them. We won't be responding further. Don't contact us any further.

That is how they treat this Senator doing his constitutional responsibilities, and, obviously, you can tell by that quote that this is very much obstruction.

What the Biden EPA has done is to obstruct a core constitutional requirement of the Congress; that is, knowing how appropriated taxpayer money is being used by the executive branch. Moreover, the EPA couldn't even respond on behalf of grantees, and it is pretty simple because the EPA doesn't even possess the records that I was requesting from the nonprofits. That is a whole different problem for the EPA.

Specifically I asked grantees—and this is a quote from my letter: