

subpoenas. We were able to subpoena the shell corporation that owns the yacht. We were able to subpoena the shell corporation that owns the private jet. We were able to subpoena the shell corporation that owns the Adirondack estate where that famous painting was made of Harlan Crow, Justice Thomas, Leonard Leo, and the rest of the little crew hanging out together.

So that is all under active investigation, and that is not going to stop, I can assure you.

As I mentioned, the legislation passed the committee. It passed it on July 20, 2023. We are looking forward to having a robust discussion about Supreme Court ethics when this is brought up on the Senate floor for a vote in Congress.

Finally, we have had an interesting set of successes, I guess I would call them, at this point with the Judicial Conference. The Judicial Conference is the body that runs the judicial branch of government. It is its own sort of board of directors. It is made up of the chief judges of all the different circuit courts of appeals and a chief judge from a district court in each circuit. It is a very august body.

Here are some of the things they looked at. They looked at what I call the “Scalia trick.” The “Scalia trick” was to get someone to tell a resort owner to invite Scalia on a free vacation with a personal invitation on the free vacation and then not disclose it as a gift because it was “personal hospitality.”

Well, when that was pointed out to the Judicial Conference, they blew that scheme to smithereens because it is obvious that arranging a personal invitation to a resort owned by somebody you don’t even know does not amount to the kind of personal hospitality—like family trips—that is the basis for allowing nondisclosure of big gifts.

The question before them now is, when they did that, was that a clarification of the law or was that a new rule? It took Scalia’s lawyers about a nanosecond to jump in and say: Oh, this is a new rule, and we are going to comply with it.

He doesn’t usually talk about this stuff, so you think about, why did the lawyers pop up with that? Well, the reason they popped up with that is they wanted to say it was a new rule because if it was a clarification, which is what the Judicial Conference said it was, they would have to go back and amend all his previous filings that were filed in violation. That would be a fine mess.

So Justice Thomas has a lot at stake in that determination, and that determination is before the Judicial Conference right now.

You are looking at this problem of fake amici that I described. They have agreed that the rule is inadequate and that it is not appropriate for parties and the public not to know who is really in the courtroom but to have these masks—these front groups, these

fakes—showing up without disclosing who is really behind them.

They are still investigating what I call Thomas-Crow 2.0. There was a first round of billionaire gifts from Harlan Crow to Justice Thomas back in sort of 2009, 2010, 2011 for yacht and jet travel. That was investigated by the Judicial Conference, and then the matter was closed. Then he went back and did it all over again. So they are still investigating the Thomas gifts from Harlan Crow, second round, 2.0.

Then I have asked them to look at something Justice Alito did, which was to offer an opinion in the Wall Street Journal editorial page about a matter that was not only likely to come before the Court but was virtually certainly headed to the Court. He offered an opinion, which is something they say in their confirmation hearings they are not allowed to do, but he did.

Worse still, it wasn’t just about some free-range topic; it was about a specific dispute, an ongoing dispute. He took sides in an ongoing dispute. Worse still, he took sides in that ongoing dispute at the behest of a lawyer on the other side in that dispute. By the way, that lawyer represented his friend Leonard Leo, so there was a personal connection, and the gravamen of the dispute was our ability to find out about free gifts of travel to Justice Alito. So at the end of the day, his improper opinion protected him from public scrutiny for gifts he should not have been receiving.

So all of that is before the Judicial Conference. I want to express my appreciation to the Judicial Conference for their diligence in doing this. Obviously, this is not the way they would like to spend their time, but the Supreme Court has not given them much choice by continuing to engage in all of this bad behavior, and it is all related, and it is all part of the scheme.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

NOMINATION OF ADEEL ABDULLAH MANGI

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an exceptional American, Adeel Mangi, who is a nominee for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He is eminently, extraordinarily, very impressively qualified.

He has degrees from Oxford University and Harvard Law School. For over 20 years, he has been a highly respected complex litigation attorney in one of our country’s premier law firms, where he has become a star, a star in the legal profession as one of the very best trial attorneys in our country.

Beyond finding success after success professionally for his clients, he has spent countless hours providing pro bono services for causes fundamental to our American ideals of freedom, liberty, and justice.

The support of Adeel Mangi has inspired, for his nomination, incredible support. It has seen support across the ideological spectrum and speaks to the

character and integrity of the man. Dozens of prominent State and national organizations, ranging from civil rights groups, law enforcement associations, anti-hate groups, professional legal groups, all have endorsed his nomination, including so many from New Jersey and of course the New Jersey State and Federal bar associations. Mr. Mangi has received the highest possible rating for judicial nominees from the American Bar Association.

A bipartisan—bipartisan—group of former State attorneys general have written in support of his nomination, writing:

It is our collective judgment that Mr. Mangi is eminently qualified to sit on the Court. Mr. Mangi’s legal career has been exemplary of a commitment to the rule of law and upholding constitutional principles.

Folks from the left, folks from the right, law enforcement, civil rights groups, and more—he has not only earned this nomination from the President of the United States, but his qualifications from that have been celebrated by groups all across our political spectrum and people in charge of our public safety in New Jersey.

Despite all of this though, what is outrageous to me, disappointing, and disheartening is that he is facing unimaginable attacks, not on anything that he has said or written, not on any of the cases that he has successfully tried, but he is facing attacks on his character.

And these attacks are recalling some of the darkest chapters of our Nation’s history. The attacks on him are unwarranted. They are untruthful. They have no basis in fact. And, sadly, they smack of bigotry.

They intend to exploit people’s fears. They intend to exploit people’s fears of his faith. They are attacks on his character and his reputation, attempts to smear, attempts at fear.

I was blown away when the Republican leader came to the floor today and said something I never imagined I would hear on this floor about a man of such character.

He said that Mr. Mangi has “anti-Semitic affiliations.” Now, I know how people here feel when someone calls someone else racist or a bigot or makes accusations of hate, but the Republican leader said he has “anti-Semitic affiliations.”

He said Mr. Mangi “has repeatedly chosen . . . to mingle with supporters of terrorists and cop killers.”

That is a staggering charge, and yet it is the pattern that we have seen against Mr. Mangi—attacks not on his writings, not on his legal work, not on anything he has said, one quote that has come from his mouth. They are making an accusation that he mingles with supporters of terrorism, people who want to threaten the lives of Americans.

This is a continuation of what he faced in his confirmation hearing.

I read to you the interrogation that was given to him by the junior Senator

from Texas. When asked if he would condemn an event by the Center for Security and Race at Rutgers Law, which had an event with a panelist who had been convicted once before of terrorism—an attempt to make an association, a trial of his character based on no association—Mr. Mangi responded: I never heard of this event prior to today. It was never brought to the advisory board, which met once a year to discuss.

You see, he was on the advisory board of this organization at Rutgers Law that met once a year to evaluate scholarly writings to be included in an academic journal.

And so Senator CRUZ read a 2021 letter from the Center for Security, Race and Rights at Rutgers Law School related to the Israel-Gaza conflict. Mr. Mangi, again, explained that he had never seen the letter before. He was continuing to press that the letter—and repeatedly interrupted as Mr. Mangi tried to answer again and again.

Mr. Mangi: “Senator, I said this earlier, but let me repeat it because I think it is critical.”

He is interrupted by Senator CRUZ and asked a question that had never been asked before to any nominee—ever—before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CRUZ: “Do you condemn the atrocities of Hamas terrorists?”

Mr. Mangi immediately, “Yes. That was what I wanted to address.”

Mr. CRUZ: “Is there any indication of those atrocities?”

Again, a question never asked before. “Senator, I will repeat myself,” Mr. Mangi says.

Interrupting him, “I am going to ask you again, is there any justification for those [horrors]?”

Mr. Mangi: “This was going to be my next sentence, Senator, which is I have no patience, none, for any attempts to justify or defend those events. Senator, I don’t think anyone feels more strongly than me.”

And the Senator asked him whether he supported the 9/11 attacks—a question posed to no other American before our committee—the attacks of 2001.

Mr. Mangi: “Senator, I don’t think anyone feels more strongly about what happened on 9/11 than someone who was there, who saw with my own eyes the smoke billowing from the towers.”

What American is asked such questions? What American has to defend their condemnation for the 9/11 attacks? What American has to declare that they don’t support terrorism? What American? Adeel Mangi, who happens to be a Muslim American.

This is disgusting. This reeks of sort of old-style attacks to appeal to fear in order to smear someone’s character based upon who they are, based upon their faith.

And an accusation by our Republican leader that Mr. Mangi somehow mingles with supporters of terrorists and cop killers, while the Anti-Defamation League—the preeminent American organization that fights against anti-

Semitism, the preeminent organization that investigates anti-Semitism, the preeminent organization that time and time again condemns anti-Semitism—sprang to Mr. Mangi’s defense.

I quote from their letter:

Mr. Mangi was subjected to aggressive questioning unrelated to his professional expertise or qualifications. Rather, he was forced to provide responses to a wide range of inquiries regarding his views on global strategic considerations in a manner that inappropriately politicized these issues and raised serious questions regarding pretext and bias.

Just as associating Jewish Americans with certain views or beliefs regarding Israeli government actions would be deemed antisemitic, 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.

The ADL then called on Senators to offer Mr. Mangi a fair vote, based on his qualifications, his fitness for the job, his legal acumen, his sense of fairness.

But the ADL wasn’t alone in responding to these attacks on his character. As the Republican leader said, “mingling with supporters of terrorists and cop killers,” “anti-Semitic affiliations,” Jewish groups jumped to his defense. The American Jewish Committee, the National Council for Jewish Women, a coalition of 15 Jewish organizations, representing more than a million Jewish Americans, have also voiced their condemnation of this line of attack and their support for Mr. Mangi.

In Mr. Mangi’s hearings, my colleagues asked the unbelievable that any American would be insulted to be asked: Was there any justification for 9/11?

Was there any justification for 9/11?

Never before asked to any other appellate nominee, but a Muslim American has to endure such questioning. This is unique and insidious to be directed to the first Muslim ever nominated by a President.

And yet, even so, Mr. Mangi sat there in that hearing with grace and dignity and unequivocally affirmed his patriotism, unequivocally affirmed his condemnation of terrorism. With dignity and grace and a calm voice, he rejected anti-Semitism outright. He said there is no justification for terrorist attacks like 9/11; there is no justification for the horrors of October 7; and he reaffirmed his belief in the right for Israel to exist. This is all on the record.

Mr. Mangi has faced accusations that tried to smear his character, to whip up fear against him, to turn him into something he is not. But this isn’t the only angle of unfounded attack. Mr. Mangi is said to be—and I quote again—“he is said to be mingling with cop killers.” “Mingling with cop killers”—the absurdity of that statement, the falsity of it is extraordinary. It is extraordinary in the face of all the law enforcement groups in my State that

support him. It is extraordinary in the face of all the legal leaders and the law enforcement leaders in my State who support him.

And where does this accusation even come from? What could possibly fuel such an accusation? It is because he served on an advisory board for a non-profit called the Alliance of Families For Justice. What does this organization do? It supports formerly incarcerated individuals and their families through reentry services, legal support, and political advocacy. That is the organization.

And how did he get affiliated with this organization? Well, as a pro bono case, he chose to represent the family of an inmate in New York State prison, a man who had disabilities, mental disabilities, who was murdered by correctional officers. And as is a tradition in our legal system, he provided that family not with criminal support but in a civil case. And he won that civil case. Not only did he win that civil case showing it was a wrongful death, but he won the biggest settlement for the family.

Pastor Julia Ramsay-Nobles sent a letter to the Senate about this case. It captures the truth about Mr. Mangi’s work with the Alliance For Families of Justice. It says:

Dear Chairman DURBIN and Ranking Member GRAHAM:

My name is Julia Ramsay-Nobles. I am a Pastor who lives in upstate New York. I recently learned that my attorney, Adeel A. Mangi, has been nominated to serve as a Circuit Judge for the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. I was so happy and proud to hear the news. I wanted to send you a letter to help you know Adeel as I know him.

In April of 2015, I received the worst possible news: my brother, Karl Taylor, who was incarcerated in an upstate New York prison, had died. Karl suffered from serious mental health challenges. The prison officials told me that he was “code blue,” but did not explain what that meant. I could not get any answers. I felt so powerless and helpless.

Several months later, a community group introduced me to Adeel and his team of lawyers . . . While I was hopeful—I never give up hope—I also felt skeptical. Why would these people care about what happened to my brother? Would they care about me?

Over the following five years, I came to know Adeel as a man of integrity and an extraordinary lawyer. He and his team spent five years investigating my brother’s death and holding the powerful to account. They delivered the answers that I was seeking, horrific as they were. While we are from very different backgrounds, we formed a close bond that I cherish to this day.

A Christian pastor, a Muslim lawyer, working together for American justice. And that affiliation with this organization focused on helping families of incarcerated people, an advisory board that he sat on that never had a meeting, where he just agreed to accept cases, that is the affiliation which has earned him to be called by one of the most powerful people in our country “someone who mingles with supporters of cop killers.”

That is a lie. It is a lie. It is smearing the character of an American who

stood up for the powerless. It is a lie, an attack on a man because of who he is.

Never before has a judicial nominee before the Judiciary Committee been asked to renounce terror, never before has a nominee before the Judiciary Committee been accused of such baseless attacks.

This is the world's most deliberative body, but we have not brought the world's most deliberative body to the point where we are not evaluating the character or the fitness of a supremely well-qualified nominee to serve in our judiciary. But what has this room become now? A place where ad hominem, salacious attacks that have no basis in fact, in fact, twist the truth, which is: This is a man who stands up for our shared values and our shared ideals, who stands for the honor of our flag and country. It is character assassination. It is guilt by association. It is a cancer on our society.

We deserve better. Mr. Mangi deserves better. This is a man whose parents left their home country, yearning for a better future. They worked hard to put him through the best schools they could. They came to the United States because they believed in this Nation; they believed in our ideals. They had hope for the future that America would bring. They are proud Americans.

He studied at Harvard Law School to pursue a legal career to uphold the ideals of justice that we swear to, the ideals of liberty and justice for all. He reached the heights of his profession. And because at the heights of his profession, he made a decision to serve his country, he is before us as a nominee by the President of the United States, the first Muslim-American nominee to the Federal Appeals Court. This should be a great American story. It should be something we celebrate. And yet he is attacked not because of what he has written, not because of what he has said, not because of cases he has taken, not because of an interview, not because of a college law school or grad school paper. He is being attacked by made-up charges that have been debunked time and time again by the facts.

And how would any of us feel if we were applying for a position to serve our country—be it on the bench, be it in the military, be it in administration—and be subjected to this type of attack and accusation?

Think about what they are going through now as a family. When you Google “Adeel Mangi,” when his children do or his grandchildren do, do you know what comes up? The Washington Times article which published an image that superimposed the green Hamas flag onto his face. When his children or grandchildren Google him, what will come up? The Judicial Crisis Network, a rightwing front group dedicated to attacking President Biden's judicial nominees. They have spent tens of thousands of dollars running an

ad calling him “Anti-Semite Adeel,” complete with video of planes crashing into the Twin Towers on 9/11.

It pains me to repeat those words into this historical record, but there is no other way to express how debasingly low groups have gone to attack him. It is grotesque.

When Muslim Americans or any American that has their faith that might be different looks to the highest deliberative body in the land and what did they do when the first Muslim tried to reach for the appeals court to serve as a judge? What happened to him? This is the story that will be told. This is toxic. This is dangerous. This is cancerous.

The attacks recall some of the darkest chapters of our history. It speaks back to the time when loyal Americans were sent to internment camps, not because of their beliefs, loyal Americans were sent to internment camps not because of things they said or they wrote; loyal Americans were sent to internment camps just because they were Japanese. It goes back to the dark chapters of our country, the Red Scare that led to the blacklisting, the persecution, the loss of jobs, the loss of reputation because of the Red Scare that was spread.

There was a courageous Republican who stood on this floor during that time of the Red Scare, a courageous Republican. I want to read Margaret Chase Smith's words, perhaps to wake up the echoes of this body of how horrible and dark this moment is to maybe cast some light.

Margaret Chase Smith, in the time of the Red Scare, spoke from this floor:

I think that it is high time that we remembered that we have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution. I think it is high time that we remembered that the Constitution, as amended, speaks not only of the freedom of speech but also of trial by jury instead of trial by accusation.

Whether it be a criminal prosecution in court or a character prosecution [here] in the Senate, there is little practical distinction when the life of a person has been ruined.

Margaret Chase Smith continues:

Those of us who shout the loudest about Americanism in making character assassinations are all too frequently those who, by our own words and acts, ignore some of the basic principles of Americanism.

The exercise of [our] rights should not cost one single American . . . his reputation or his right to a livelihood nor should he be in danger of losing his reputation or livelihood merely because [of what happens to be his beliefs or, I add, his faith.]

As a warning to a Republican leader that accuses a good American of mingling with supporters of terrorists and cop killers, of saying that he has anti-Semitic affiliations, I read these final words of Margaret Chase Smith:

I do not want to see the Republican party ride to political victory on the Four Horseman of Calumny—Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear.

I doubt if the Republican party could, simply because I don't believe the American people will uphold any polit-

ical party that puts political exploitation above national interest.

Adeel Mangi is a great American. Adeel Mangi has served his nation. Adeel Mangi has risen to the top of his profession. Adeel Mangi has dared to represent the poor against the powerful. Adeel Mangi has become the first in our country's history to be nominated by a President of the United States to the highest court—to the highest appeals court.

What has he been greeted with? A fair evaluation of his character? A fair evaluation of his body of work? A fair evaluation of his writings? A fair evaluation of his speeches? A fair evaluation of his temperament? No. He has been accused of mingling with terrorists and cop killers. He has been accused of being anti-Semitic. Why? Is it because he is Muslim?

I heard a speech against him reading all the groups that stand against him. I read some of the supporters: the AFL-CIO; the SEIU; the Association of the Federal Bar of New Jersey; the Asian Pacific American Lawyers of New Jersey; the Capital Area Muslim Bar Association; Muslim American Judicial Advisory Council; Muslim Bar Association of New York; New Jersey Muslim Lawyer's Association; National LGBTQ+ Bar Association; New Jersey State Bar Association; South Asian Bar Association of New Jersey; South Asian Bar Association of North America; former attorneys general, Republican and Democrat, and U.S. attorneys, Republican and Democrat, of New Jersey; a group of New Jersey sheriffs; Hispanic American Law Enforcement Association; New Jersey Asian American Law Enforcement Officers Association; LGBTQ Law Enforcement Liaison of New Jersey; Muslim American Law Enforcement Association; the National Black State Troopers Coalition; NOBLE of New Jersey; NOBLE, Region 1; the National Organization of Black Women in Law Enforcement; the American Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists; the American Jewish Committee; the Anti-Defamation League; the Alliance for Jewish Renewal; Bend the Arc; Jewish Action; Carolina Jews for Justice; Jewish Community Action; Jewish Democratic Council of America; Jewish Women International; National Council of Jewish Women; New York Jewish Agenda; Society for Humanistic Judaism; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; the Shalom Center; the Workers Circle; Zioness; Alliance for Justice; the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; the National Women's Law Center; the NAACP Legal Defense Fund; the NAACP of Hunterdon County; People for the American Way; American Indivisible; Muslim Advocates; Muslims for Progressive Values; the Republican-appointed Honorable Timothy K. Lewis, former judge, U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania; members of New Jersey's local leadership; former colleagues from a joint defense group;

Partners of Jewish Faith; the letter I read from Pastor Julia Ramsay-Nobles; and the list goes on.

Mr. President, I beg your indulgence because this is one of the sadder days I have had in the U.S. Senate. I believe in this place. I believe in these values. But I see this moment that we are about to take a step to break a barrier in this country. Even the State of Israel has had Muslims on their supreme court. But as soon as we try to elevate a Muslim man to our court of appeals, he gets attacked by the words of the Republican leader for “mingling with terrorists and cop killers,” for being an anti-Semite, denounced by Jewish groups, but yet those charges will forever be a part of this RECORD, that this deliberative body made those allegations against this man.

Yes, I am sad, and yes, this is personal because my parents told me as a little boy, when I was the first one just to go to grade school, my brother and I, the first Black children to cross the threshold and go to a school—my parents told me: Stand proudly, and pledge allegiance to that flag because this country stands for you even though your skin color is different. This country’s values are your values even though you go to a different church in town; that, yes, you may face discrimination by people who are cultivating in their baseness of values, but don’t stop believing in love and community and peace and justice. That will light your way—good people from all backgrounds. You may be the only Black boy in your class, but it is an American classroom, and this country stands for justice and liberty and peace.

Those values and that faith and that hope have driven me every single day to try to make this Nation better and more real. And then 10 years into my Senate career, I sit proudly as our President does something never done before—to nominate a Muslim for the court of appeals. And I see what happens to him. I see him slandered and maligned, dragged through the mud and accused of the most heinous things, having to defend his beliefs, having to say over and over again that he condemns 9/11.

So I want to take this moment to say this is a great American. No matter what happens to his nomination, this is a great American who should be proud of his work. We should celebrate him whether we vote for him or not. We should cherish a moment like this that makes history.

For all of those children in our country who have parents like mine who say “You may be different. You may look different. You may pray different. Your family may come from a different corner of the globe. But this is still the country for you,” I tell those children “Don’t give up even though this ugly example hangs in the air. Don’t give up even though this man has been trashed and smeared and maligned. Don’t give up on this country.” Do you know

why? Because Adeel Mangi has not given up.

You can write him down in history with your bitter, twisted lies, but no matter what you do to guys like him or me or everyone who loves this country, we will rise. Nothing you can do will ever, ever impinge the character of this great American. Nothing you can do will ever dim his love for this Nation.

This is a sad time in the U.S. Senate. More people should be on this floor condemning what is happening to this man.

But, today, I say “God bless America” because our truth, no matter what others do to it, I promise you, will go marching on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is Mr. Matt Turner, one of my colleagues in my Senate office.

Mr. President, I want to talk about one of President Biden’s nominees to be on the Federal Bench, but first I want to digress for a moment.

I love animals, and I especially love dogs. If only people had the hearts of dogs, the world would be better off.

The Presiding Officer and I, of course, are in the same profession—politics. Politics takes a big heart and a lot of wind and a thick skin. I try not to worry too much about what anybody thinks of me—except dogs. I really like dogs.

I used to have a beagle. His name was Roger. I loved Roger to death. We lost him a few years ago to cancer.

Roger was a stray. Actually, Roger was raised to hunt rabbits. If you know anything about beagles, when a beagle gets on a scent, the beagle is oblivious to everything else. They just follow that scent. Roger got on the scent and got lost and showed up at my house, so Becky and I took Roger in.

Roger was a rascal. He was a rascal. He loved us, but he couldn’t help himself. Whenever there was a small crack in the door, Roger was gone. He was out and gone, and he stayed gone 2 or 3 days. I would worry incessantly. Oh, is he hurt? Will he come back? I love Roger.

He would always come back. But about half of the time when Roger would come back, he would come back dragging roadkill. I wouldn’t let him inside with his roadkill, so he would go in the backyard, and he would hide his roadkill—he didn’t think I was watching—Roger would hide his roadkill under the back porch.

I miss Roger.

Sometimes—not always but sometimes—the nomination process that the White House uses to select Federal judges—the nomination process is what I am talking about—looks to me like something Roger was hiding under my back porch. I just don’t understand it. I don’t understand the criteria or the process the Biden White House uses to put people on our Federal bench.

Now, I am not suggesting that President Biden hasn’t made some good

nominations because he has, and I voted for his nominations who I thought were qualified. But I think it is also—any fairminded person would have to conclude that over the past several years, President Biden has nominated some people to the Federal bench who, quite frankly, are not qualified to judge a pie contest. That is just a fact. That is my opinion, but if you go look at the testimony of all of those nominees, I think you will see I am right.

With respect, the President’s pick of Mr. Adeel Mangi is, frankly, one of his worst.

Mr. Mangi is affiliated with an organization that calls itself the Alliance of Families for Justice—the Alliance of Families for Justice. In fact, Mr. Mangi is not just affiliated with this group; he is on its advisory board.

One of the Alliance’s founders was a member of a domestic terrorist organization. What does that mean? One of the Alliance’s founders was convicted of murdering police officers in cold blood. He killed cops.

Now, the Alliance of Families for Justice on whose board Mr. Mangi sits—or at least sat—advocates for the release of people who kill cops. Let me say that again. I didn’t know such organizations existed. The organization on whose advisory board Mr. Mangi sits or sat advocates for the release of people who kill cops.

This organization has even called people who kill police officers freedom fighters. Freedom fighters. Why? I know that sounds crazy. That is because it is. It is also why so many law enforcement organizations have sent all of us on the Judiciary Committee letters opposing Mr. Mangi’s nomination. I have never gotten so many letters or phone calls from law enforcement supporting or opposing—in this case, opposing—a nomination.

For example—I am not going to read all of them. I would be here the rest of the evening. For example, take the National Sheriffs’ Association. I think most of us have heard of them. The National Sheriffs’ Association wrote to all members of the Judiciary Committee, and here is what they said. I am quoting now. These are not my words but the sheriffs’ words. “Mr. Mangi’s association . . . with an organization advocating the release of convicted cop-killers is seriously disturbing.” That is coming from the sheriffs.

According to the National Sheriffs’ Association, the Alliance’s position—on whose advisory board Mr. Mangi sat or sits—according to the sheriffs, the Alliance’s position “is not only tone-deaf to the sacrifices made by law enforcement [officials], but also disrespectful to the victims of heinous crimes, as well as the family and friends of officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice.”

We also heard from the National Association of Police Organizations. I think most people have heard of them.

They said this about Mr. Mangi's nomination: Mr. Mangi's "conscious work with the Alliance shows an anti-victim and anti-police bias that would certainly cloud his decisionmaking as a judge." That came from the police. Those aren't my words; those are law enforcement's words.

By itself, Mr. Mangi's work for and with this organization that I refer to as "the Alliance" should be disqualifying, but there is more. There is a lot more.

From 2019 to 2023—4 years—Mr. Mangi also served on the advisory board of another group, and this group calls itself the Center for Security, Race and Rights—the Center for Security, Race and Rights. This organization is steeped in hatred and anti-Semitism. I don't know any other way to put it. I think any reasonable person who looked at the center's work would agree with me, at least as to my description.

Now, every single American I know—and I will bet this is true for the Presiding Officer too—every single American I know remembers where they were on September 11, 2001. We call it 9/11. We don't even have to explain ourselves anymore; we just say "9/11," and every American knows what you are talking about.

On the 20th anniversary of 9/11, Mr. Mangi's Center for Security, Race and Rights, on whose advisory board Mr. Mangi either sits or sat, sponsored an event. Here is the title of their event: "Whose narrative? 20 years since September 11, 2001." The purpose of this event was to blame America and blame Americans for 9/11. That is why they held the event. This event and the speakers there blamed "U.S. imperialism"—not the terrorists; "U.S. imperialism"—for the 9/11 attacks that killed thousands of innocent American citizens.

The event featured some of the most despicable speakers that even the most fertile imagination would be challenged to come up with. One of those speakers was Mr. Sami Al-Arian. Mr. Al-Arian was convicted of providing support to the Palestinian Islamic Jihad. Another speaker, Mr. Rabab Abulhadi, has ties to terrorist hijackers. A third speaker, Mr. Hatem Bazian, publicly called for an intifada in the United States. Hard men. Rough words. American imperialism.

Mr. Mangi claims that he didn't know about this event—that is what he told the Senate committee—but his center has a long, long history of sponsoring vile, hate-filled events, and that is just a fact. That is not rhetoric; that is just a fact. Are we really expected to believe that Mr. Mangi had no idea what the center was up to? He sat on its advisory board, for God's sake.

Now let's talk about the director of this center on whose advisory board Mr. Mangi sat. The director also has a vile history of bad behavior. In 2021, the director of this organization on whose board Mr. Mangi sat signed a letter. That letter is posted on the Alli-

ance's website. So far as I know, you can go to it and read it right now.

In the letter, the director says that she is "in awe"—"in awe"—"of the Palestinian struggle to resist violent occupation, removal, erasure, and the expansion of Israeli settler colonialism"—"Israeli settler colonialism."

Hamas murdered, raped, maimed Jewish men, Jewish women, little Jewish children, and according to Mr. Mangi's organization's director, it is Israel's fault.

The center's director describes himself as being in respectful awe. I think the vast majority of Americans would describe themselves as being nauseated.

The center's director, of whom I speak, also personally recruited Mr. Mangi to serve on the center's advisory board.

Again, are we really expected to believe that Mr. Mangi didn't know about the director's vile behavior? Did Mr. Mangi not even run a single Google search on this person?

On top of all of that, I do not believe—this is one person's opinion—I do not believe that Mr. Mangi told me the truth in our Judiciary hearing. When I asked him about his involvement with this radical organization, Mr. Mangi told me he only provided "advice on academic areas of research." That is what he told me. He said: My only involvement is "advice on academic areas of research."

Those aren't my words; those are Mr. Mangi's words. But it turns out he was also funneling money to the organization—tens of thousands of dollars from himself and from his law firm. I didn't know that at the time of the hearing. I wish that I had.

With these facts in mind—and I have tried just to stick to the facts—I find it very hard to believe that anyone can in good faith—no. Strike that.

I find it hard to believe that a fair-minded, objective person who is not involved in this nomination can defend Mr. Mangi's nomination. Some of my Senate colleagues are doing that. That is OK. Sometimes people disagree, and that is a good thing. I believe in having two sides, opposing sides, come together in a dialectic. Sometimes that is how you find the truth. But it has gotten kind of personal. I regret that.

Some people—not all people; the Presiding Officer doesn't do this—some people, when they are losing an argument, tend to rely on epithets, you know—"You are a racist" or "You are a sexist" or "You are a misogynist" or "You are a Nazi" or "You are a bigot" or, as in this case, "You are Islamophobic." Some of the Members of this body have made that suggestion. They have suggested that all of the people who are opposing Mr. Mangi's nomination based on the facts that I have just tried to describe as fairly as I could—some Senators have suggested that asking Mr. Mangi questions about his involvement with these organizations is Islamophobic.

One of my colleagues—which, again, is his right—came down to the Senate floor, and he said that certain Republican members of the committee "believed that he," referring to Mr. Mangi, "must be a terrorist because he is a Muslim." Wow. That got my attention. That is not true.

I believe that Mr. Mangi is not qualified to be a Federal judge because he supports organizations that celebrate people who kill law enforcement officers; he supports organizations that hate Americans; and he supports organizations that hate Jews.

When President Biden, as I said earlier, has nominated qualified people to serve on the Federal bench, I have supported them regardless of their race, regardless of their gender, regardless of their religion.

I confess to asking tough questions in committee. That is my job. When you are put on the Federal bench, you are there for life—for life. You are unelected, and you are there for life, and you have the full power of the United States of America, the most powerful country in all of human history, behind you, so you had better get it right.

Just a few years ago, for example, I voted to confirm one of President Biden's nominees, Mr.—now judge—Zahid Quraishi. Mr. Quraishi happened to be at the time the first Muslim-American Federal judge. I voted for him. He is doing a great job. Unlike Mr. Mangi, Judge Quraishi was not on the board of an organization that celebrates and advocates for the release of cop killers. He was not on the board of an organization that sponsors anti-American events and blames 9/11 on American imperialism. Judge Quraishi was qualified and is qualified to serve on the Federal bench. Mr. Mangi is not. He is just not. That is not Islamophobia; that is just a fact. And I think anyone who is being honest with themselves—particularly if you go look at the confirmation hearings and read the evidence—I think any person who is being honest with themselves would agree.

So, for these reasons, I ask my colleagues to oppose Mr. Mangi's nomination, and I urge President Biden to withdraw it.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

REMEMBERING PHIL HOWE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today, I rise to honor the life and mourn the loss, the passing, of a fellow Kansan, Phil Howe.

Mr. Howe lived most of his life in Manhattan, KS, and he loved his hometown. He was an active member of the community, a local businessowner, and a proud Kansas State University Wildcat.

The only place he may have loved more than Manhattan was his family's farm. During his younger years, Phil spent time at that farm. The farm was near Chapman and Solomon, where he enjoyed farming and fishing.