dared to call attention to these disqualifying facts. So let's get it straight: Radicalism has no place in higher education or on the Federal bench.

Unfortunately, the President doesn't seem to agree. While he defends Mr. Mangi and his radical associations, he refuses to render an unqualified rejection of campus anti-Semitism. In fact, when asked about it, he seemed to say: Well, there are good people on both sides.

It is hard not to see this mealy-mouthed equivocation for what it is: a President prioritizing the feelings of his political supporters over moral clarity.

Anti-Semitism is not a nuanced academic theory. It is not just one of many ''difficult viewpoints,'' as the White House Press Secretary seemed to suggest yesterday in reference to campus disruptions. It is not justified by political disagreements with Israel and its government. It is not entitled to take over campuses and make life miserable for Jewish students.

Luckily, some reasonable observers are getting mugged by reality. Just as a growing number of Democrats are rejecting Mr. Mangi's nomination, a growing number of prominent Ivy League alumni are rejecting the surging radicalism of their alma maters.

But that will only go so far. Leaders must lead. Administrators must take charge of their institutions. The basic objectives here couldn't be clearer: On campus, protect Jewish community members. Clear the encampments. Let students go to class and take their exams. And allow graduations to proceed.

Here in Washington, withdraw radical nominees and force the Departments of Justice and Education to investigate civil rights violations.

If moral clarity does not prevail—in the ivory tower and in the Biden administration—this could go down as a particularly shameful moment in our history.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. ERNST. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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.

REMEMBERING COLONEL RALPH PUCKETT

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, typically, legends emerge long after individuals or events they commemorate have passed into history; however, the legend of COL Ralph Puckett was present among us for decades.

Ralph Puckett, Jr., was a giant of a man in his accomplishments, duties, and passion. He started on his journey into legendary history when he graduated from West Point in 1949, commissioning as an infantry officer.

Following the outbreak of the Korean conflict in 1950, Lieutenant Puckett volunteered to command the newly created Eighth Army Ranger Company. This freshly minted lieutenant was charged with turning non-infantry soldiers into battle-ready Rangers in only 5½ weeks, and to no one's surprise, he did it.

On November 25, 1950, the Rangers dismounted their vehicles under heavy fire and secured Hill 205 against an onslaught of North Korean fighters, who outnumbered them nearly 10 to 1. Lieutenant Puckett was instrumental in this effort. He called in supporting artillery fires dangerously close to his position. He intentionally exposed himself on six occasions, allowing the enemy force to focus on him while enabling his men to locate and kill the enemy.

Lieutenant Puckett was wounded twice in this battle, but he refused to be evacuated and instead chose to continue to lead his men while they repelled five consecutive counterattacks.

It wasn't until the sixth counterattack, with supporting artillery fires unavailable and in the face of almost certain death, that Lieutenant Puckett ordered his men to leave him behind due to his injuries and the chaos surrounding the close-quarters fighting. Instead of leaving their commander, two rangers fought their way to Lieutenant Puckett, and they dragged him to safety. For his actions, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

Following the battle that nearly cost Lieutenant Puckett his life, he was sent to Fort Benning, GA, for recovery. There he met his future bride, Miss Jeannie Martin. They would later be married on November 26, 1952, the second anniversary of the battle.

Instead of retiring from military service, Lieutenant Puckett chose to serve as a combat arms officer at the U.S. Army Ranger School. In 1967, Lieutenant Colonel Puckett volunteered for a tour in Vietnam, where he once again led soldiers in combat, most notably during the Tet Offensive.

In 1971, after 22 years of service, Colonel Puckett retired from Active Duty, but that was not the end of Colonel Puckett's service.

When he and his family moved to Georgia in 1990, he devoted much of his time to speak on base and to teach leadership courses. He also participated in numerous field training exercises and visited soldiers serving all around the world to pass on the leadership and life lessons he learned during his multiple combat tours.

Colonel Puckett's influence extended to virtually every senior infantry officer and noncommissioned officer who served at Fort Benning—now Fort Moore—or within the 75th Ranger Regiment for nearly two decades. However, his mentorship wasn't limited to the men and women at the senior ranks. It resonated across all levels of our military.

Between his leadership while on Active Duty and mentorship after he retired, Colonel Puckett influenced generations of servicemembers, including me. I was fortunate enough to meet Colonel Puckett when I worked on Fort Moore in the 1990s. When I was deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, from 2003 to 2004, Colonel Puckett, who had become a mentor, would write to me with words of advice and motivation. For a man of his stature and legacy to spend this time mentoring a young captain on deployment is just one small example of the character and tireless devotion of Colonel Puckett.

Rightly so, Colonel Puckett was an inaugural inductee into the U.S. Army Ranger Hall of Fame. He would go on to be the honorary colonel of the 75th Ranger Regiment from 1996 to 2008. On May 21, 2021, Colonel Puckett's Distinguished Service Cross was upgraded to the Medal of Honor in a White House ceremony that I was very, very privileged and fortunate to attend.

Colonel Puckett lived a life of devoted service to our Nation. His military awards include the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, two Silver Stars, three Legions of Merit, two Bronze Stars with ''V'' device for valor, and five Purple Hearts. In addition, he has the Combat Infantryman's Badge with star, Special Forces Tab, and Ranger Tab.

Colonel Puckett was a legend—a legend of a man; a legend of a soldier; a legend of a ranger; a legend of a husband, father, and grandfather; and a legend of a citizen who knew no limits to serving his country.

After a literal lifetime of dedication and service to America, it is only fitting that we pay tribute to Colonel Puckett in the Rotunda of the Capitol to honor his sacrifices and the sacrifices of the Silent Generation and the more than 5,700,000 men and women who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the ''Forgotten War.''

This country is forever in your debt for answering the call to fight against tyranny and oppression in the Korean conflict.

Mr. President, I ask that we take a moment of silence in memory of Colonel Puckett and the contributions he made both in and out of uniform and to acknowledge the sacrifices his family made when Colonel Puckett's duties took him away from home.

(Moment of silence.)

It has been a privilege and an honor to know such a man and to have walked in the footsteps of giants who have come before—giants such as COL Ralph Puckett, Jr.

May he rest in peace.

''Rangers Lead the Way!''

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

PROTESTS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last week, the Senate completed a critical task to support our national security. After months of uncertainty, this

Chamber overwhelmingly approved a bill to reaffirm our commitment to our allies who are facing unrelenting aggression around the globe.

This legislation will bolster Israel's fight to defend itself against terrorists like Hamas; it will support Ukraine's ongoing defense against Russian forces, who are violating their sovereignty; and it will help countries in the Indo-Pacific, like Taiwan, counter or deter, hopefully, Chinese aggression.

America has always been known as one that stands by its friends and allies. That is actually one of the biggest differences between the United States and Russia and China. We have friends. We have like-minded allies based on our commonly shared values.

Now, there are strategic shotgun marriages, which you see now between Iran and China and Russia, but nobody would mistake that for a shared value concept. It is just that they are arrayed against the United States. ''The enemy of my enemy is my friend'' is the philosophy that they embrace.

We have a long and proud history of defending democracy and standing up to adversaries, and I am glad Congress approved this legislation to continue in that tradition. As America's friends and allies combat evil around the world, we are seeing a new wave cropping up right here on American soil.

Since Hamas attacked Israel on October 7 of last year, anti-Israel protests have taken place across the United States. For our country, protests are nothing new. In fact, they are privileged and guaranteed under the First Amendment to the Constitution. So impassioned debate is not a recent innovation. But there is a clear line between protesting and rioting and an even clearer line between free speech and violence. Regrettably, that line has been crossed time and again in recent months.

Some Hamas sympathizers and supporters have used the guise of protesting to harass and intimidate Jewish students across the United States, and some of the most disturbing incidents have been those on college campuses. In the wake of October 7, campuses have experienced a wave of anti-Semitic attacks targeting their Jewish students.

Last fall, for example, Jewish students at a small university in New York City sheltered in the college library as pro-Palestinian protesters banged on the doors and windows and chanted outside. Multiple students at Tulane University in Louisiana were physically assaulted during a tense protest. A Cornell University message board was flooded with anonymous comments that threatened to physically harm any Jewish person on campus.

These incidents highlight a dangerous resurgence of anti-Semitism that has spread like wildfire across college campuses, and too many people have tried to defend these attacks as constitutionally protected speech. I would hurry to point out that not everybody involved in these protests and this civil disobedience or even violence is even a student at these universities. In many ways, I think this is another manifestation, another indication, more evidence that many of our institutions of higher education have lost their way. They should be focused on educating the next generation of American leadership, not being engaged in or being primarily focused on this sort of activity.

It is shameful and disingenuous to suggest that attacks, particularly physical attacks and threats against Jewish students, qualify as protected speech. As I said, the First Amendment does protect speech, but it protects the right to protest peacefully. It does not give anyone the freedom to riot, to threaten, or to carry out acts of violence against other people or to even violate the rules of their universities.

The Supreme Court has long recognized that neutral protections like time, manner, and place provisions do not violate the First Amendment, and those are the sorts of guidelines and rules that these protesters need to follow. When they don't follow them, they should be held accountable for it.

Sadly, pro-Palestinian groups are continuing to create a threatening environment by attempting to occupy and disrupt some college campuses.

At Yale University, a Jewish student journalist was attacked by a pro-Hamas mob while attempting to film a protest. She was stabbed in the eye with a Palestinian flag, and her attacker has still not been identified.

This last weekend, at Harvard, anti-Israel protesters raised a Palestinian flag in the place where the American flag should have been flying.

Protests at the University of Southern California have created such serious safety concerns that the university actually canceled its main graduation ceremony.

Some of the most alarming incidents have taken place at Columbia University, where pro-Palestinian students set up a tent encampment at the center of the campus. The situation became so tense last week that a prominent rabbi urged Jewish students to leave campus and stay away for their own safety. The situation grew even more dangerous overnight as an anti-Israel mob broke into an academic building and used furniture to barricade the doors. They shattered windows, hung pro-Palestinian banners from the building, and a member of the building's maintenance team said he was briefly held hostage.

These institutions are known as some of America's elite universities, but their response to these incidents has fallen far short. They have allowed protesters to break university rules, threaten other students, particularly Jewish students, and create a dangerous and hostile environment for their entire campus communities.

Under title VI of the Civil Rights Act, colleges and universities are required to provide an environment free from discriminations based on race, color, or national origin. So it is shameful that some of these so-called elite universities in our country do not take that responsibility seriously.

Last week, protests erupted at the University of Texas in Austin, where I live. But I am glad to say the response there was far different than what you have seen in many other parts of the country. As hundreds of protesters attempted to occupy the campus, the university hasn't wavered in its commitment to preserve a safe environment for all of its students. They have recognized the danger that these demonstrations could pose to Jewish students, as well as disrupting the entire campus community that is, after all, dedicated to education. It is hard to get a good education if you can't go to class or you can't participate in activities on your own campus for fear of violence or threats.

The University of Texas took swift action to break up last week's demonstration before things turned violent, and it has continued to do the same thing as the situation heats up this week.

I want to commend my friend UT Austin president Jay Hartzell for doing what so many other college presidents have failed to do. As protesters took over the campus, he, with the backing of our Governor and our other elected officials, made it clear that the university's rules would be enforced.

As we have seen at college campuses across the country, uncontrolled—I should say—or out-of-control protests create a very dangerous environment for all students, the faculty, and staff. They create an especially threatening environment for Jewish members of the campus community who are targeted solely based on their ethnic identity or their religion.

These types of attacks are despicable and un-American, and I am glad the University of Texas at Austin made it clear that anti-Semitism has no place on its campus.

Last week, 26 of my Republican colleagues and I urged the Biden administration to do more to protect Jewish students on college campuses. Anti-Semitic mobs are paralyzing many campuses and threatening Jewish students.

Given the wave of protests across the country, the Biden administration must do more to combat anti-Semitism and ensure that every student has a safe place to learn.

Universities, of course, are no strangers to activism. Generations of young people have organized protests and raised their voices on a variety of political and social issues, and that is entirely appropriate.

The right to protest is fundamental to our democracy, but it does not grant anyone the ability to say or do whatever they want without consequences.

Recent demonstrations have turned into a breeding ground for anti-Semitism, and we must do more to protect

all of our students and restore safety to our college campuses and restore the very basic mission for which they were founded, which is to educate the next generation of Americans.

I yield the floor.

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. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 598, Georgia N. Alexakis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Peter Welch, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Mark Kelly, Debbie Stabenow, Michael F. Bennet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Georgia N. Alexakis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 155 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—42

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

NOT VOTING—5

Booker	Lankford	Risch
Kelly	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here today for the 31st time in my series on the special interest scheme that captured the U.S. Supreme Court.

There is an old adage that the best way to show that one stick is crooked is to set a straight stick down next to it. So, today, we are going to look at some sticks.

Supreme Court Justices are caught over and over receiving enormous gifts, often from people very interested in Court proceedings, and refusing even to report the gifts as the law requires. The disciplinary process for these Justices is virtually nonexistent. Not even basic factfinding takes place. So let's compare the Court's dereliction about its own conduct with the straight stick of how other Federal officials are treated when they don't report gifts, but let's start with a recap of the history.

After the first round of gifts of yacht and jet travel from billionaire Harlan Crow to Justice Clarence Thomas, the Judicial Conference, which is the administrative body which oversees the judicial branch of government, investigated the matter, and that investigation buried the situation rather than get to the bottom of it to the point even of applying the wrong legal process. The law requires the Conference, if there is a reasonable chance that the failures to disclose were willful, to refer the determination of willfulness to the Attorney General. There is good reason for that. One, the Attorney General has real investigative resources. Two, judicial clubbiness and mutual back-scratching is less likely. Three—three—the Attorney General can determine whether other crimes, like tax and false statement violations, are also implicated. But, back then, the Judicial Conference did not make the referral nor did they issue any public report providing any real explanation for that decision. On that transparency score, zero.

Recently, the Judicial Conference, to its great credit, blew up what I call the Scalia trick, which is, one, arranging free secret vacations with resort owners and, two, pretending the generous, free hospitality he received was personal hospitality under the disclosure laws because he had been extended a personal invitation.

Well, obviously, that is not what they mean in the disclosure laws by ''personal hospitality.'' It is supposed to cover things where you know people or it is your in-laws or it is your college roommate—where there is a true, longstanding personal relationship, not somebody you don't know extending you a personal invitation. So stopping that nonsense was good, but here is the transparency part:

The Conference described what they did in that decision as a clarification—a clarification—which was also good because it acknowledged that was the rule all along. They weren't making a new rule; they were clarifying what had been the rule all along. But then along comes Clarence Thomas, who is usually completely silent on his many ethics failings—completely silent. On this occasion, he instantly launched lawyers to say he would comply with what they called the new rule. The trick to that stunt was the claim that this was a new rule. Claiming it was a new rule meant that he would only have to comply going forward, not go back and clean up years of false financial filings.

So I have asked the Judicial Conference to clarify what it meant by ''clarification.'' So far, I have received no answer. So, as of now, years of Thomas and Alito misfilings remain uncorrected, but it is still going on. So, on that, the transparency score is pending.

The Judicial Conference is also reviewing the more recent round of Harlan Crow-to-Clarence Thomas mega gifts, and it is to be hoped that the judges now on the Judicial Conference will do a better job of following the law than their predecessors did; that they will make a proper referral to the Attorney General and that they will let the facts be properly investigated. There is no sign of that yet, just that the investigation is ongoing. So the transparency score on that is also pending.

The danger in all of these decisions about judicial disclosure failings is the judges may see the whole mess as just a problem in a judicial bubble, their own little concern that is really no one else's business. But it is far more serious than that, as I am about to show.

However, if there is nothing to compare their own behavior to, nothing to compare their own stick to, they might not notice its crooks and its bends.

Let me go back to one of the reasons for referral to the Attorney General: He is positioned to determine if criminal laws were also violated along with disclosure laws. There is every reason to believe that Justices who failed to report big emoluments on their judicial disclosures also failed to make required tax disclosures.