

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 597.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Nancy L. Maldonado, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant 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. 597, Nancy L. Maldonado, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

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, Raphael G. Warnock, Laphonza R. Butler, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, June 17, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

DISASTER RELIEF FUNDING

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, the United States had 75 major disaster declarations since July of 2023. Just last week, a flood tore through southern Florida, and it is only a matter of time before another State is hit.

This “natural disaster” caucus is growing, and it is growing quickly. It is a caucus none of us want to join nor do we ask to join, but instead are forced into it with a single mission: to help our constituents—our communities that have been through unimaginable suffering and pain—to get the resources that they need.

Vermonters know all too well the immense toll a natural disaster takes. It

takes it on our communities and our economy.

Nearly 1 year ago, Vermont experienced nonstop rain over a period of several days. It led to flash flooding, washouts, and mudslides all across our State. It was brutal. Homes and businesses and farms and public infrastructure were damaged, and many were destroyed. It was an all-hands-on-deck moment, and neighbors helped neighbors dig out. From the municipal level to the Federal Government, we tried to help people get back on their feet. And we did get back on our feet, but the damage—if it was your home, if it was your business, if it was your farm—is still lasting.

I have come to the Senate many times since the floodwaters receded to share stories of Vermonters. Their stories are of resiliency through hardship. Vermonters have stories of community and grit and determination. And I am proud, of course, of Vermonters, but I believe that this is the case in communities throughout our Nation.

But our recovery, despite that, is far from complete. Madam President, I will say it loud, clear, and directly: Vermont needs more recovery money. What happened to these families and to these businesses was an act of nature—no fault of their own—but they deserve a shot to get back on their feet.

And as I revisit communities that were hit hard by flooding—places like Barre, Johnson, Hardwick, Montpelier, Ludlow, and Londonderry—it is clear that work to recover from this flood will last for years. There are home and business buyouts that are stalled, farmers who need help, and resiliency projects that need to get done before the next flood comes—and it will be coming.

We need supplemental disaster funding, and we really do need it now. The funds need to be flexible so that our communities in Vermont, in Hawaii, in Texas, in Florida, in California, and in other States can use the funds as needed for their recovery to their unique needs.

A flood and a fire require different recovery strategies, and that should be reflected in the funding. That is why the community development block grants for disaster recovery are so critical. They are flexible. They are localized. These funds give the communities the flexibility needed to rebuild and recover, allowing them to prepare for future disasters and safeguard their communities. Senator SCHATZ has been a fantastic partner in this, and I am thankful for his leadership as subcommittee chair on the Appropriations Committee.

Last week, the Joint Economic Committee's Democratic majority released a new report on the economic cost of flooding. The findings are really stunning: Flooding will cost \$180 to \$496 billion each year. These costs are probably an undercount. They are only a fraction of what our communities truly endure as we recover from a flood. I en-

courage my colleagues and everyone listening to read this report. See for yourself how climate change is ravaging our economy.

There are obvious ways that flooding costs our economy: structural damages to our homes, farms, businesses, schools, transit systems, and more; infrastructure upgrades needed to protect against future flooding; and the direct and indirect commercial impacts from flooding. But then there are the costs that you might not consider: costs associated with flood-related deaths; decreased tax revenues; increases in insurance premiums; and crop loss, among the many other costs.

This should be an alarm bell. It should give pause to every one of my colleagues in the Senate and in the House because every State could be the next victim of the severe weather that is all about us as a result of the change in our climate. Vermonters know it all too well.

But there is good news. We can do something to mitigate these costs. Another recent analysis found that every \$1—\$1—spent on flood resiliency efforts saves up to \$318 in flood-related damages. It is a pretty good return on investment.

And if you want to talk about cost-saving measures, resiliency funding should absolutely be paired with recovery funding for natural disasters. We need to build back in a more resilient way after natural disasters hit, not build back in the same way for it to be done all over again.

I was just in Brattleboro on Friday, where I saw a new FEMA-funded floodplain restoration project. It is terrific. A similar project helped downtown Brattleboro avoid damage during the July floods and will hopefully help the community avoid flooding in the future when the rains come again.

We cannot rebuild in the same way and in the same place and hope for the best. The reality is that climate change is here, and it is unpredictable. We need to do more to make our homes, farms, and communities more resilient.

Gone are the days, by the way, of so-called climate havens. In 2020, ProPublica and the New York Times Magazine published a report that found that in Vermont, Lamoille County, Orange County, Franklin County, and Essex County were the top four counties in the United States to live in to avoid climate change-related crises.

I can tell you—as a Vermonter—no longer. Climate change has come to all of Vermont.

I am going to keep working with my friends and colleagues, the senior Senator from Vermont Senator SANDERS and Representative BALINT in the House, to get Vermont the flood recovery funding we need, but I want to do that in partnership with every other Senator and Representative whose districts need flood recovery funding.

Congress, in both Chambers and both parties, need to come together to help

all our States impacted through a natural disaster. The next natural disaster, be it a flood, a fire, a tornado, or a hurricane, could happen in your State. And as we often say, there but for the grace of God go I.

I urge my colleagues to have grace for their fellow Americans and fellow colleagues who need the help now because you never know when your State could be next.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MUSTAFA TAHER KASUBHAI

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to state my strong support for Judge Mustafa Kasubhai's nomination to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon.

There are a number of reasons why I believe Judge Kasubhai's nomination is appropriate, but today I will focus on what I think are three priorities of his. First is public safety; second is understanding rural communities; and third, his nomination has broad support from leaders across the political spectrum.

During his 6 years serving as a Federal magistrate judge on the Oregon district court, Judge Kasubhai has demonstrated a commitment to the rule of law and community security—so much so that the judge's nomination has been endorsed by the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police, the Acting U.S. Marshal, and others in law enforcement.

The Oregon Association Chiefs of Police took special note of Judge Kasubhai's record. They called that record a "distinguished record of service and dedication to upholding the rule of law, as well as his unwavering commitment to supporting crime victims and law enforcement" as one of the many reasons that the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police is backing his nomination.

In one case earlier this year, Judge Kasubhai ordered a White supremacist, alleged to have defaced a synagogue, to be held in detention while court proceedings were ongoing. Judge Kasubhai deemed this individual too great a threat to the community, despite defense counsel calling for him to be released on home confinement. This is just one example which shows Judge Kasubhai's commitment to prioritizing public safety.

Second, the judge knows and understands the challenges facing rural communities across the country. Before serving as a magistrate judge, he practiced law in Klamath Falls, OR. For those who aren't familiar with my State, this is a very rural area with an agricultural and natural resource-driven economy.

Judge Kasubhai has been there for these communities. Anyone with Judge

Kasubhai's resume would have had a lot of opportunities available to them, and it says a lot about the judge's character and care for rural Oregonians that he chose to go where his skills were most needed, and he saw that he could make a difference in rural Oregon.

In talking with Judge Kasubhai, it is clear that his time working in Klamath Falls gave him a firsthand understanding of how the judicial system affects rural communities. I have no doubt that he will use this knowledge to ensure that his decisions are fair to all and take into account the needs of communities, large and small.

Finally, not only did Judge Kasubhai advance through a bipartisan judicial selection commission in my State, he also brings with him letters of support from leaders across Oregon and the political spectrum. Notably, he has the support of both a judge appointed by President Bush, who called him "the very soul of fairness," as well as a Trump-appointed U.S. attorney.

Judge Kasubhai's extensive legal accomplishments, unwavering commitment to serving our communities, and dedication to the rule of law are all reasons why I urge my colleagues to vote for his confirmation. This is a judge who will truly lead—and lead in a way that complies with the rule of law.

I yield the floor.

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 senior assistant executive 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. 510, Katherine E. Oler, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Charles E. Schumer, Gary C. Peters, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Alex Padilla, Laphonza R. Butler, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Richard J. Durbin, Jeanne Shaheen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Mazie Hirono, Sherrod Brown, Tina Smith, Catherine Cortez Masto, Jeff Merkley.

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 Katherine E. Oler, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "nay" and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) would have voted "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 198 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—39

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

NOT VOTING—11

Cotton	Hoeven	Merkley
Cramer	Luján	Risch
Durbin	Lummis	Sinema
Fetterman	Menendez	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 39.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.