

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.

SUPREME COURT ETHICS, RECUSAL, AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise because now is the time to pass Senator WHITEHOUSE's legislation to require the Supreme Court of the United States to adopt a binding and enforceable code of ethics, create a process for investigating misconduct, and improve the disclosure and transparency requirements for the Justices on our Nation's highest Court. I thank my colleagues Senators WHITEHOUSE and DURBIN for their leadership on this issue.

I have long believed that rule of law is central to our democracy and that preserving public trust in our institutions is vital to the health of our Republic. It is important that the American people have confidence that the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States are making decisions based on the facts and the law, not private interests.

The Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States know this, too. In fact, the very first canon that the Supreme Court set out in its code of conduct last November states that "a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States should maintain and observe high standards of conduct in order to preserve the integrity and independence of the federal judiciary."

This isn't the first time that Congress has had to address the need for transparency and ethical requirements for government officials. In 1978, in the wake of Watergate, Congress passed the Ethics in Government Act, which requires certain public officials, including Supreme Court Justices and members of the executive branch, to make disclosures about their financial interests, including income they receive from a source outside the Federal Government, gifts, debts they owe, and sales of certain real estate and stocks.

Unfortunately, in recent years, we have seen an alarming rise in reports of ethically questionable behavior by the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States in regard to accepting and not disclosing gifts as required under the law. For example, we learned that in 2014, Justice Thomas allowed a billionaire to buy his mom's house and fix it up for her—and pay for the Justice and his wife to take lavish vacations. We also know that same billionaire paid for Justice Thomas to attend a trip to Malaysia on a private jet and a superyacht. That trip was valued at over \$500,000 and was not disclosed by Justice Thomas. Justice Thomas was required to report these gifts, but he didn't. Instead, we only found out about it through the work of investigative journalists.

There needs to be an enforceable code of ethics and mechanisms to investigate, and if necessary, take corrective action when the Justices don't take their reporting obligations seriously. That is how we preserve the American people's confidence in the in-

stitutions of government, including the Supreme Court.

Just like transparency, judges are supposed to be above politics and avoid even the appearance of bias. In 1974, Congress passed a law requiring the Supreme Court's Justices, as well as other Federal judges, "to recuse themselves when their impartiality might be reasonably questioned."

This was reiterated by the Supreme Court's own code of conduct adopted in November which states that a Justice should disqualify himself or herself where they have "a personal bias or prejudice concerning a case."

In fact, the Justices are no strangers to the practice of recusing themselves when there is an appearance of impropriety. For 50 years, the Justices have followed the recusal law. For example, in 1995, Justice Thomas recused himself from *United States v. Virginia* because of his son's enrollment at Virginia Military Institute.

If the Justices of the Supreme Court sat on any other Federal court, the clear and enforceable code of ethics would ensure that they recuse when their impartiality might be reasonably questioned. But at the Supreme Court, the decision to recuse is up to each Justice, and there is no explanation required.

These examples demonstrate why Senator WHITEHOUSE's bill—the Supreme Court Ethics, Recusal, and Transparency Act—is so important. It would require the Court to adopt an enforceable code of ethics. It requires that Justices disqualify themselves from cases in certain situations where their impartiality could be reasonably questioned such as if they have received gifts from parties appearing before the Court. It requires that Justices disclose the same information concerning gifts, income, and reimbursements as required by Members of Congress. And it provides for a process by which individuals may file complaints that a Justice has violated the code.

This is hardly a radical proposal and this isn't about attacking one Justice or another. The majority of Americans—75 percent according to a recent report—support a binding ethics code for the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I call on all my colleagues—Democratic, Republican, and Independent—to come together, pass this bill, and help bring the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States in line with the ethical requirements and accountability procedures that every other Federal judge in this country already abides by.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, I was unable to vote on June 13 due to testing positive for COVID-19. If I had been present, I would have voted on rollcall vote No. 197 in support of the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to pro-

ceed to S. 4445, a bill to protect and expand nationwide access to fertility treatment, including in vitro fertilization.

RIGHT TO IVF ACT

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in support of the Right to IVF Act of 2024. I would like to start by thanking Senators DUCKWORTH, MURRAY, BOOKER, and LEADER SCHUMER for their work championing this legislation, which would help ensure IVF services are available and accessible to patients across the country.

It should appall all of us that one of the most common forms of assisted reproductive technology is under attack, but it should not surprise us. Extreme MAGA Republicans across the Nation will stop at nothing to exert control over women's bodies.

Just 3 months ago, my Republican colleagues in this Chamber had the opportunity to stand with women and families. Instead, they blocked a bill to expand IVF access and family-building services for veterans and servicemembers, which after serving our Nation, for many, is the only way to make their dream of having a family possible. And in February, the Alabama Supreme Court issued a ruling that ground IVF treatments to a halt and ushered in weeks of chaos and confusion for would-be parents.

But it is not just Alabama; women and families across the Nation face fear and uncertainty as extreme Republicans in several other States seek to limit access to IVF altogether. Following the Alabama Supreme Court's ruling that embryos created through in vitro fertilization are considered children, so-called fetal personhood bills have been introduced in Kansas, Florida, Colorado, Iowa, Louisiana, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Utah during the 2024 legislative session.

We have seen example after example of MAGA Republicans' shameful crusade to rip reproductive health services out of the hands of people who need them. It is dumbfounding to see this level of blatant contradiction from Republicans who love to tout themselves as being the "pro-life party" on the campaign trail. But here, in the room where it happens, they are advocating for policies that would foreclose for so many families the opportunity to have children. Their actions speak much louder than their words. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, IVF has proven to be a necessary family-building tool. Yet the "party of family values" is intent on blocking this bill.

Across the country, including in States represented by my Republican colleagues, there are stories of countless women and their significant others who have spent years waiting, saving, and praying for the day they could