

## 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 consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jose Javier Rodriguez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, earlier this morning, the legislative text for the final six appropriations bills was released, I am happy to say, clearing another hurdle toward our ultimate goal of funding the Federal Government. I thank the appropriators, their staffs, and everyone involved for working themselves to the bone to release these bills. I imagine some folks here in the Capitol are past the point of exhaustion.

This funding agreement between the White House and congressional leaders is good news that comes in the nick of time. When passed, it will extinguish any more shutdown threats for the rest of the fiscal year, it will avoid the scythe of budget sequestration, and it will keep the government open without cuts or poison pill riders.

It is now the job of the House Republican leadership to move this package ASAP.

Just like the funding bills Congress passed 2 weeks ago, this package avoids draconian Republican cuts on major Democratic wins that help American families, American workers, and America's national defense. We have secured an increase in childcare services. We boosted disease research and prevention. We funded school mental health programs and suicide prevention—so needed in this modern world in which we live. We are strengthening the border with new resources for frontline personnel. We are investing in safer, more secure elections. We Democrats are very proud of both. The hard right pushed for cuts that would have impacted K through 12 education and services for low-income families. Democrats stopped it. The hard right wanted to add terrible poison pill riders to attack freedom of choice. Democrats stopped that too.

Now Congress must now race to pass this package before government funding runs out this Friday. Once the House acts, the Senate will need bipartisan cooperation to pass it before Friday's deadline and avoid a shutdown.

I want to thank President Biden, Speaker JOHNSON, Leader JEFFRIES, and Leader MCCONNELL for their leadership. I also thank Chairwoman MURRAY and Vice Chair COLLINS and their staffs, as well as my own staff, for their tireless leadership of the Appropriations Committee throughout the entire process. I don't think they got any sleep from about Saturday to today. I really thank particularly Meghan Taira and Ray O'Mara from my staff, who did such a strong job on this.

### JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. President, now on judge shopping, last week, I was very pleased that the Judicial Conference announced commonsense policy reforms limiting the practice of judge shopping, by having civil cases with statewide or nationwide implications assigned to judges at random.

Unfortunately not everyone was pleased—namely, those on the right who have made judge shopping their specialty. So today, I am sending a followup letter to the Judicial Conference encouraging them to defend their policy as it is implemented across the country.

I am also writing the chief judge of the Northern District of Texas, where judge shopping has been rampant, urging him to apply the reforms of the Judicial Conference as quickly as possible. When I wrote to the chief judge roughly a year ago about judge shopping, he said fixing the problem through random assignments presented logistical challenges.

So, in my letter today, I will ask the judge to please explain: How many civil cases with statewide or national injunctions does his jurisdiction handle? How does the district create rules for case assignment? How will they implement the Judicial Conference's rules to ensure public trust? The answers to these questions would greatly inform us in the Senate as we think about ways to strengthen our judiciary.

I must say, over the past week, I have really been troubled to hear some of my colleagues on the other side attack the Judicial Conference simply for doing its job, which Congress authorized it to do over a century ago. My Republican colleagues forget or ignore that even their side has acknowledged in the past that not only is judge shopping a problem but that the Judicial Conference itself has a role to play to address it. But now some Republicans are howling at the Moon over this announcement. My friend the Republican leader, for one, led his colleagues in writing a number of chief judges, urging them to basically ignore the Judicial Conference.

Let me say this: Judge shopping as it is practiced here in Texas distorts the entire judicial system. There is only one judge sitting in one district. Hard-right plaintiffs from across the country know they can bring their cases and get them before a judge who has views that are way over. It jaundices the fairness of the legal system. When you

know there is one judge sitting and he or she has a particular philosophy and you have to get that judge when you file a case, again, it attracts hard-right plaintiffs who are so unrepresentative of America, like bees to honey, and they all flock to those one or two or three judicial districts where there is one judge or a minimal number of judges sitting.

My Republican colleagues actually refuse to explain why judge shopping is remotely defensible—because it so distorts the system and casts a cloud of unfairness over our whole judicial system, like the system is sort of rigged because you know you can get this judge, and you know what the outcome will be. The mifepristone case is the most glaring, immediate example.

Of course, my Republican colleagues don't explain why, by the way, because, of course, they can't say the quiet part out loud: Judge shopping is a key part of the hard-right's toolkit, something they have built up over the years. Just take the example of the Amarillo Division of the Northern District of Texas, where a single district judge has become the darling of extremist litigants for his outlandishly fringe opinions on everything from birth control to affordable healthcare to LGBTQ discrimination. Republicans might not want to say it openly, at least those who opposed here, but nobody is being fooled. Conservatives go to this one judge because they know he is on their side ideologically—what an abuse of the functioning of our Federal courts.

So, yes, the Judicial Conference was right to issue reforms to limit judge shopping. Neither party—no philosophy—should be able to cherry-pick judges of their choice. Random assignment is the way it works for nearly every court in the country.

I am always ready to work with Senators from either party to consider all commonsense ways to improve how our courts are administered. I wholeheartedly agree that Congress should take its role of judicial oversight seriously, particularly at a time when activist judges committed to special interests are eroding the rule of law. Congress must provide a check on the judiciary, and that is what the Founding Fathers intended in our legislation as decades, even centuries, also point out.

In this instance, it is troubling Republicans can't seem to admit the obvious: Abuses like the ones we see coming out of the Northern District of Texas should come to an end.

### REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE BUDGET

Mr. President, on the RSC budget, yesterday, as President Biden announced tens of thousands of new jobs to take our country forward, House Republicans released a budget plan that would take us backward. The Republican Study Committee's fiscal year 2025 budget plan reads like a wish list for Donald Trump and the MAGA hard right, and it sure is a loser for the American people.

Remember, the RSC is hardly a small group. It is made up of over 170 House Republicans—80 percent—80 percent—of the House Republicans, including Speaker JOHNSON and his entire leadership team. The budget plan is the Republican agenda, plain and simple.

By releasing this budget, the vast majority of House Republicans are calling for cuts to Social Security and Medicare. Do you hear that, the folks in America? The vast majority of House Republicans want to cut Social Security and Medicare. Beware of what they want. They want to threaten IVF access. They want to deny healthcare to people with preexisting conditions. They want national abortion bans, and they want to sabotage any hope of lowering prescription drug costs. The list could go on and on.

The Republican Study Committee plan is cruel; it is fringe—way out of line with what most Americans want—but, unfortunately, it is what the House Republicans envision for our country. It speaks volumes that, on the very same day President Biden and Democrats announced tens of thousands of new jobs to increase U.S. microchip production, the Republican Study Committee called for over \$1.5 trillion in cuts to Social Security.

It is just like former President Donald Trump, who recently said, “There is a lot you can do,” regarding cuts to Social Security.

The RSC’s budget also doubles down on Republican efforts to threaten in vitro fertilization access.

Republicans can pretend all they want to sound moderate on women’s choice now that they have created so much backlash, but this budget plan makes it clear they are the same old anti-choice, anti-woman party, and I have no doubt—should they get into power in the House, Senate, and Presidency, which I don’t think will happen and hope and pray won’t happen—choice will be clearly at risk.

That is not all. The RSC’s budget would gut the Affordable Care Act and CHIP, the Children’s Health Insurance Program, which means ripping away health coverage for millions of American families and people with preexisting conditions. The RSC’s budget, of course, includes trillions of dollars in tax cuts for the wealthiest few and large corporations, leaving working-class people—middle-class families—to pick up the tab.

The Republican agenda released yesterday is dangerous and disastrous for America and the American people. The contrast could not be clearer. While Democrats invest in the American people, the Republican agenda released yesterday is dangerous—disastrous—for the American people.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF ADEEL ABDULLAH MANGI

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have spoken repeatedly about the nom-

ination of Adeel Mangi to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Notwithstanding his anti-Semitic affiliations, it seems every week a new law enforcement organization announces its opposition to this nominee for his record of associating with the most radical type of anti-police activists—those who support cop killers.

Apparently, some Democrats are finally listening to law enforcement and the Jewish groups sounding the alarm.

Last week, a number of Democratic Senators reportedly told the White House that they didn’t think Mr. Mangi has the votes. This, of course, produced a panic on the left. This week, a New York Times columnist accused Republicans of Islamophobia for criticizing Mangi and his dalliance with anti-Semitic activists. Democrats, on the other hand, were urged to get in line and vote for him.

Who is giving this advice?

Well, the author of the piece herself had previously speculated that Israel may be engaged in genocide in Gaza. She called the Israeli war of self-defense a “charnel house of horrors.” She defended the anti-Semitic Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement, and she even got mealymouthed about the October 7 attacks, saying:

[T]wo can play the game of who started it and who is to blame, rolling back the clock to biblical times to try to fix ultimate responsibility for the catastrophe of Israel and Palestine.

So, again, what has Mr. Mangi done to deserve friends like these or, indeed, to merit such a vehement, blinkered defense from the Biden administration?

Just yesterday, the White House called opposition to Mr. Mangi’s nomination a “smear campaign solely because he would make history as the first Muslim to serve as a federal appellate judge.”

How insulting. What self-respecting attorney wants to hear that a President cares more about the demographic tick boxes than their life’s work?

Besides, in the case of Mr. Mangi, Senate Republicans’ opposition has absolutely nothing to do with his Muslim faith. Rather, it has everything to do with his longstanding sympathy for and association with some of the most radical elements in society.

I happily voted for the first Muslim article III judge at the outset of the Biden administration, also of New Jersey—so did 31 of my Republican colleagues—in one of the largest bipartisan votes for a judge in the Biden Presidency. But we didn’t support this nominee because he was Muslim; it was because he had an extraordinary personal and professional background.

Mr. Mangi’s associated center at Rutgers asks convicted terrorists if we overly “exceptionalize” 9/11. Judge Quraishi, on the other hand, thought 9/11 was exceptional and joined the Army soon after, rendering honorable service in Iraq.

Mr. Mangi spent his career making millions in defending corporate clients

like foreign energy companies, massive drugmakers, and even chocolate monopolies, all while volunteering his time to support anti-police activists. Judge Quraishi, on the other hand, supported law enforcement professionally, first at Immigration and Customs Enforcement and then as an assistant U.S. attorney.

We are told that any questioning of Mr. Mangi’s record is Islamophobia. On the other hand, the terrorist-adjacent Council on American-Islamic Relations demanded that Senators probe Judge Quraishi’s experience in the Army and in law enforcement, saying their concerns “must be addressed.”

According to Democrats’ rhetoric, shouldn’t this organization also be condemned for Islamophobia?

Two Muslim Biden nominees with records as different as night and day—Republicans happily supported the nominee who served his country and backed the blue. We have and we will continue to oppose the nominee who has repeatedly chosen, instead, to mingle with supporters of terrorists and cop killers.

I hope more Democrats will join us in opposing Mr. Mangi, and should they fall victim to spurious associations of bias, perhaps they should remind the White House of an alternative candidate, rested and ready, in the Federal courthouse in Trenton, NJ.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. 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.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Adeel Mangi has been nominated by President Biden to serve on the Third Circuit. We have had a hearing before the Judiciary Committee, a vote in the committee, and his name is on the calendar.

In recent weeks, we have heard an amazing number of attacks against this individual. It is hard to imagine some of the things that are being said about him. They bear no resemblance to the truth.

What was said this morning on the floor of the U.S. Senate is painful. To accuse a nominee of being anti-Semitic is heartbreaking when it is not true. In this case, it clearly is not true.

After the initial hearing on Mr. Mangi, who would be the first Muslim to serve on the Federal circuit bench, we received communications from several groups in defense of his nomination and critical of the questioning that took place in the Senate Judiciary Committee. One of the most noteworthy came from the Anti-Defamation League.

The ADL issued a statement in response to what they called “the inappropriate and prejudicial treatment of