

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 117 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Rounds
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	Kennedy	Schumer
Butler	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Lujan	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Collins	Menendez	Tillis
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Fetterman	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Graham	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	
Heinrich	Romney	

NAYS—42

Barrasso	Ernst	Mullin
Blackburn	Fischer	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Ricketts
Braun	Hagerty	Risch
Britt	Hawley	Rubio
Budd	Hoeben	Schmitt
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tuberville
Crapo	Marshall	Vance
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The clerk read the nomination of Robert J. White, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:20 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUJÁN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

NOMINATION OF ADEEL ABDULLAH MANGI

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee, one of my highest priorities has been the confirmation of judges to fill vacancies on the Federal bench.

Since the beginning of the Biden administration, the Senate has confirmed over 191 highly qualified, independent, and evenhanded jurists to the Federal bench. It is my belief that there will be a total of 193 in just a matter of days. They represent the best of our legal system—demographically and professionally diverse judges who respect the rule of law, adhere to precedent, and

above all, answer only to the Constitution. We should add another nominee to that list—Adeel Mangi—who has been nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

What an amazing resume. Mr. Mangi is eminently qualified. He graduated from Oxford and Harvard Law School. He spent more than 20 years in private practice at one of the top law firms in the United States. He focuses his practice on commercial litigation. Mr. Mangi has served as counsel of record in more than 30 matters before Federal appellate courts as well as eight amicus briefs submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court. He has gone above and beyond in his pro bono practice, devoting more than 4,000 hours to representing clients in religious discrimination, asylum, and employment discrimination cases.

Based on his record, you would think Mr. Mangi would be quickly confirmed, but I left out one fact on his resume: He is a Muslim American.

The treatment of this nominee before the Senate Judiciary Committee has reached a new low in many ways but also with historic echoes. More than 50 years ago, President Lyndon Johnson nominated Thurgood Marshall, who would become the first Black American to serve on the Supreme Court. In his confirmation hearing, Justice Marshall faced racist questions and McCarthy-like accusations that he was a Communist. If that sounds familiar, it is because Mr. Mangi—the first Muslim American nominated to the Federal appellate court—faced similar treatment at his hearing before our committee.

Committee Republicans subjected him to irrelevant, combative lines of questioning about the Israel-Hamas war. They even asked whether he celebrated the 9/11 terrorist attacks in his home. Think about that for a second: An American coming before the Senate Judiciary Committee, of the Muslim faith, is being asked if he celebrates the 9/11 anniversary in his home each year.

During the hearing and while under oath, Mr. Mangi unequivocally condemned anti-Semitism in all its forms and condemned any acts of terrorism no fewer than 10 times—10 times at one hearing. He also repeatedly denounced any form of hate or bigotry.

Any insinuation that Mr. Mangi is anti-Semitic or a terrorist sympathizer is rooted in anti-Muslim bigotry that has no place in our country or in Congress. The claims are simply false. He has represented a broad coalition of Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Sikh, and other religious groups.

As Mr. Mangi said, it is “distinctly American for people of so many different faiths to come together in unity in this manner.”

What has been un-American has been the treatment Mr. Mangi has faced since his hearing. Republicans are trying to blame Mr. Mangi for statements by other people at events he didn't even attend and wasn't even aware of.

That is guilt by association. It is wrong. It is unfair.

Republicans have unfairly attacked Mr. Mangi for his nominal affiliation with the Alliance of Families for Justice. They falsely—falsely—claim that he supports “cop killers”—that he supports “cop killers.” That outrageous allegation could not be farther from the truth.

In Mr. Mangi's own words, he has “not represented or otherwise provided legal services to any individual convicted of killing a law enforcement officer.”

In addition, he has clearly stated:

I condemn any violence against law enforcement officers without equivocation.

As Mr. Mangi noted, it is “shocking and false” to suggest that he has sympathy for attacks on law enforcement.

On the other hand, during the Trump administration, Republicans voted unanimously to confirm two judges who had personally represented individuals who had killed police officers. Those individuals were entitled to their right to counsel—I am not arguing that point—but it just shows you how far they have gone in establishing a new standard—a totally unfair standard.

The treatment of Mr. Mangi by the Republicans puts their hypocrisy on full display. There cannot be one standard for Republican appointees and another for Democrats. Based on Mr. Mangi's actual record, more than 125 civil rights and human rights organizations support him—organizations representing more than 1 million Jewish Americans, including the National Council of Jewish Women and the Anti-Defamation League.

I want to say this point: After the terrible hearing that he was subjected to in the committee in December, the Anti-Defamation League volunteered a statement to our committee, which I read into the record, in defense of Mr. Mangi and in criticism of the harsh and unfair criticism of those at his hearing who blamed him for being anti-Semitic. Nothing could be further from the truth. These other organizations and ADL have openly supported his nomination and condemn the treatment he faced at his hearing.

In addition, Mr. Mangi has received the support of a number of law enforcement organizations, including the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives and a bipartisan group of former New Jersey State attorneys general and U.S. attorneys.

Any judicial nominee should expect a close examination of his legal career before the committee. Since first being nominated, Mr. Mangi has been prepared for just that. However, he should not have to answer for baseless and bigoted attacks that do not accurately reflect him or his record in many different ways.

In a letter of support, retired Third Circuit Judge Timothy Lewis contrasted Mr. Mangi's experience as a

nominee to his own experience as one of only two Black judges nominated to the Federal appellate court by President George H. W. Bush. Judge Lewis noted that he was treated with respect by Republican Senators as well as Democratic Senators, who held the majority. Judge Lewis urged the Senate to treat Mr. Mangi with the same level of respect that he received.

He wrote:

If people from underrepresented communities believe they will be unfairly attacked, stereotyped, and rejected by the Senate, they are likely to think twice about being nominated, thus hindering efforts to make our courts look more like America.

Judge Lewis is right. I urge my colleagues to dismiss the smear campaign against Mr. Mangi and to support his nomination.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Texas.

#### BIDENOMICS

**Mr. CORNYN.** Mr. President, if I were to choose a title for the remarks which I plan on making here briefly, I would call the title of these comments "The Case of the Vanishing American Paycheck."

Over the last few years, inflation has walloped family budgets. As we all know, prices have grown; they have grown again and grown some more, forcing people in Texas and all across America to scrimp and save just to try to get by. They have cut the number of trips to their favorite restaurant. They've made budget-friendly swaps at the grocery store by trading for less expensive items—maybe the store brand rather than your favorite brand. They have scrapped family vacations in favor of more affordable staycations. In many instances, they have had to make hard decisions between two competing, important expenses. For example, a couple of years ago, nearly 45 percent of Texans said they had to cut spending on basic necessities, including food and medicine, in order to pay their energy bill.

Polls continue to show that Americans believe they are even worse off today than they were 4 years ago, and it is easy to see why. Inflation is what has caused this basic shrinking of the great American paycheck. Real wages have fallen. Nominal wages seem to have gone up, but because of inflation, you actually have less purchasing power than you did 4 years ago. People who once lived comfortably are now living paycheck to paycheck.

Our Republican colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee recently analyzed economic data to determine just how much inflation is costing the average American family each month. They found that the average household in Texas is spending \$1,000 a month more today than they did in January of 2021 when President Biden was sworn into office—\$1,000 a month.

Biden economics, which, apparently, the President is so proud of that he has named his economic policies after him-

self—Biden economics is costing Texas families more than \$1,000 more each month, or \$12,000 in a year. On a monthly basis, that is up more than \$200 from a year ago—more than double the monthly inflation from 2 years ago.

Since President Biden took office, he and the leaders of his administration have tried to downplay the impact of inflation, but the American people aren't buying it. After all, the President gets to live in free government housing, otherwise known as the White House. He gets a nice fat paycheck each month. The President and the upper classes in America—the elites—are doing just fine. This kind of inflation doesn't change their lifestyles one bit; but for average Americans, it has a very real and negative impact.

For example, last week, the Wall Street Journal took a look at what \$100 could buy 4 years ago in the grocery store and compared that to what those same items would cost today. Four years ago, this grocery run would have cost you \$100. This includes many of the common items that families buy every week—bread and butter, eggs and milk, fresh and frozen fruits and vegetables, laundry detergent, dish soap, chicken, bread, and a whole lot more. This isn't a shopping trip for champagne and caviar; these are the basic grocery items that most people buy every single week to feed and provide for their families.

Over the past 4 years, though, the price of every single one of these items listed here has gone up. The cost of chicken, which is, frankly, a cheaper cut of meat than you might eat if you want to eat a steak on a rare occasion—well, you may have to trade down to chicken, but even chicken has gone up by 40 percent. The price of flour has gone up 43 percent, and sugar has increased 52 percent. A bottle of dish soap costs 46 percent more. Laundry detergent is 36 percent more, and a carton of eggs is up a whopping 63 percent.

Now, again, this probably doesn't affect President Biden. As I said, he gets to live in a very nice house at taxpayer expense, and he gets a big paycheck each month. He is doing just fine and so are most of the people who live in this area of the country; but where I come from and where the Presiding Officer comes from, there are a lot of people who are not part of that top 1 percent, who are experiencing the negative impact of Bidenomics and runaway inflation—the highest in 40 years.

Well, overall, this trip to the grocery store would have cost \$100 4 years ago but, today, \$136.89. In only 4 years, the price of a pretty standard grocery run has increased by 36 percent. It is a pretty startling data point, but the truth is most individuals and families in Texas and around the country don't need to see the data to know that their standard of living has decreased because of Bidenomics and 40-year-high inflation.

Folks I represent come face-to-face with higher prices every day, and it is

not just at the grocery store, as we all know. Families are dealing with higher costs for electricity, for rent, for car insurance, for home insurance, and countless other everyday expenses. These costs invariably add up, and they are having a big impact on the financial health and welfare of the people of every State, including mine.

The challenges of inflation are even more severe for those living on a tight budget or a fixed income. Think about those folks living on their Social Security benefits or maybe a pension from a job they held for 30 or more years. Keeping up with rising costs just keeps getting harder and harder and harder because of the policies of the Biden administration.

As I mentioned, people try to manage their budget. They cut down on expenses and make more budget-friendly swaps at the grocery store, and they take on additional jobs. Many Americans have simply decided that, in order to keep up, they need to get another job. So many are performing more than one.

But for many families, that still isn't enough to pay the bills and keep the lights on. Folks are exhausting their savings just to keep up with expenses, and many have been left with no choice but to take on new debt.

Where do they do that? They reach into their wallet, and they pull out their credit card. They say: I don't have the cash to pay the bills. So I will just put it on my credit card.

The average credit card debt increased by 10 percent last year—10 percent. The average credit card balance is now more than \$6,500. In Texas, the average is even higher, more than \$7,000.

So people unable to meet their rising costs of living, because of inflation, simply have no alternative other than to borrow money on their credit card.

It is easy to assume that credit card debt is caused by excessive spending on nonessential items, but that is not always the case. Experian surveyed credit card holders to understand what is driving this big increase in credit card debt. Nearly 68 percent of respondents said they had recently experienced a significant increase in their monthly bills. Among them, 75 percent said their new or increased bills have impacted their ability to pay down their credit card balances. We all know credit cards carry a much higher interest rate than you pay on your mortgage or other forms of debt.

Of course, folks aren't just taking on new debt. They are also struggling to make payments on existing debt, including student loans. When borrowers take out a loan, they know they will need to repay it. That is the deal. It is a contract. It is a legally enforceable agreement. But inflation has made that exponentially more difficult for many student loan borrowers.

I recently read a news article about how borrowers are struggling to repay their loans, given the growing cost of