

here in the Senate to brighten their election prospects with a series of show votes designed to put Republicans in a difficult position—or so the Democratic leader hopes.

I said “show votes.” And I say that because all of these votes were clearly designed to fail. The Democratic leader knew that Republicans were not going to support a border bill that had previously been rejected, a contraception bill that would jeopardize the religious freedom of healthcare providers, or an IVF bill that would allow for human cloning and genetic engineering of human embryos.

These were not serious attempts by the Democratic leader to legislate. These were future campaign talking points.

If the Democratic leader really wanted to legislate, he would be bringing up something like Senator ERNST's legislation to promote access to contraception, which has a number of Republican cosponsors—or any one of the numerous commonsense border proposals Republicans have advanced, like Senator BLACKBURN's measure to allow State and local law enforcement to detain criminal illegal aliens for ICE to deport. But that is not the legislation the Democrat leader is bringing up, because, as I said, he is not interested in legislating; he is interested in boosting Democrats' electoral chances—he hopes—this fall.

I know the Democratic leader is trying his hardest to put Republicans in a difficult spot. But as I have said before, if he hopes to have us quaking in our boots over taking these votes, he should think again because Republicans are happy to have the chance to talk about the Democrat agenda, to talk about the disaster President Biden created at our southern border—a disaster he allowed to thrive unchecked for years, despite the serious danger to our national security; or to talk about how, under the guise of protecting access to contraception—something that is not under threat, I might add—the Democratic leader brought up legislation that would not only funnel money to Democrats' allies at Planned Parenthood but would wipe out—wipe out—conscience protections for healthcare providers.

Democrats' bill specifically targets the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which is bipartisan legislation passed in 1993, back when Democrats actually believed in defending our First Amendment freedoms.

And this is not Democrats' only attempt to target this legislation and to dictate how and when Americans can live according to their faith. Take, for example, Democrats' so-called Women's Health Protection Act—more accurately called the “Abortion on Demand Act,” which would prevent healthcare providers from claiming protection under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act if their faith prevents them from performing abortions.

Apparently the “personal freedoms” that the Democratic leader mentioned

earlier this month don't include religious freedom—at least not when your faith conflicts with Democrats' policy positions.

Speaking of the Abortion on Demand Act, I find it very interesting that in a month the Democrat leader intended to be dedicated to “reproductive freedoms,” he chose not to bring up Democrats' signature abortion legislation. Is it possible that he thought that in a month in which he hoped to paint Republicans as extremists, it might not be a great idea to bring up Democrats' radical abortion legislation, lest Americans see just how extreme Democrats are on this issue? In fact, the Democrats' bill might be the most extreme abortion legislation ever considered by Congress.

The so-called Women's Health Protection Act would not only allow abortion through all 40 weeks of pregnancy, it would sweep away almost every commonsense restriction that has been upheld under Roe and would make abortion on demand at any time, for essentially any reason, the law of the land, not to mention wiping out the ban on taxpayer funding of abortion—something that has been agreed upon by both sides for nearly 50 years.

Needless to say, this is far out of step with the American people, a majority of whom believe abortion should generally be illegal during the second 3 months of pregnancy and 70 percent of whom believe abortion should generally be illegal during the final 3 months, not to mention the fact that it is also out of step with European abortion law, with 46 out of 50 European U.N. member countries restricting abortion on demand after 15 weeks. But that is certainly not stopping Democrats from pursuing one of the most radical abortion regimes in the world.

In the coming weeks, I expect we will see the Democrats' summer of show votes continue, but I suspect the American people will not be fooled by Democrats' politicking.

As for Republicans, we are happy to discuss the Democrat agenda anytime Democrats would like to bring it up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, one of the most defining days for our country throughout our Nation's history was when President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, freeing all slaves. It marked the end of one of the most shameful chapters in our country's history. But slaves in Texas wouldn't learn this life-altering news for nearly 2½ years.

It wasn't until June 19, 1865—the day we now know as Juneteenth—that Major General Gordon Granger and the Union troops arrived at Galveston, TX, and shared the news that all formerly enslaved people were now free. These newly freed men and women set out from Galveston and spread the news, and they began their lives anew. Many

traveled toward nearby Houston, and the news eventually reached the more than 250,000 slaves throughout the State of Texas.

In 1979, Texas was the first of what would become many States to proclaim the day Juneteenth as an official State holiday—1979. Every year on June 19, you will find parades, concerts, church picnics, family barbecues, and countless other Juneteenth events throughout the State.

I have joined a number of those Juneteenth celebrations over the years, but the one in 2021 in Galveston, the birth place of Juneteenth, will always stand out as one of my favorites.

Just 2 days before that celebration, a bill I authored with Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE was signed into law, officially establishing Juneteenth as a national holiday—not just a State holiday, a national holiday. This marked the culmination of many years of hard work by Juneteenth advocates in Texas, and it was an honor to celebrate with many of those advocates in Galveston exactly 156 years after Major General Gordon Granger and his troops arrived there.

I would be remiss if I didn't recognize the most tenacious advocate for the Juneteenth holiday, my friend Ms. Opal Lee, who is widely known as the grandmother of Juneteenth. Ms. Opal was driven from her Fort Worth home by a racist mob at the tender age of 12 years. Rather than turn that tragedy into hate, she made it her life's work to recognize the 2½ years it took the news of the Emancipation Proclamation to reach Texas by walking 2½ miles in different areas of the country to build awareness.

Even though Juneteenth is now a national holiday, Ms. Opal, at the tender age of 97, still walks 2½ miles in the Texas heat—she will do that tomorrow—to underscore the importance of continuing to strive for a more perfect Union. Juneteenth National Independence Day would not have been possible without her perseverance and humility, and I hope she understands and appreciates the importance of her work.

By making Juneteenth a national holiday, we have ensured that the history and significance of this day will not be relegated to footnotes in history books. Instead, it will preserve the history of Juneteenth for generations to come and serve as a reminder of the hard-fought struggle for freedom and reconciliation.

This holiday gives us the opportunity to confront the flaws of our past, to honor the progress that we have made, and to resolve to continue to work together for a brighter future.

I appreciate the hard work and dedication of those who made Juneteenth National Independence Day possible, and I wish everyone a happy Juneteenth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

## NOMINATION OF MUSTAFA TAHER KASUBHAI

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, last fall, Senator WYDEN and I had the privilege of introducing Judge Mustafa Kasubhai to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Judge Kasubhai is unquestionably qualified to be the next U.S. district judge for the District of Oregon. I know that he will do an exceptional job for the people of our State and the people of the United States under the vision of equal justice for all.

His record on the bench reflects his commitment to the U.S. Constitution, to the rule of law, and to precedent.

I will quote the judge directly. He said:

I have presided over 5,000 matters in my judicial career, and I have issued over 400 written opinions as a United States Magistrate Judge. My judicial opinions have been upheld over ninety percent of the time.

Some in this Chamber have asked: But is the judge in the mainstream?

Absolutely you are in the mainstream when you have that type of stellar record.

It is no surprise that he brings support from across Oregon, from across the legal profession, and from across the political spectrum to his judicial nomination.

He has been endorsed with the “full support” of the Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police for his unwavering commitment to supporting crime victims and law enforcement, which, in the police chief’s opinion, “make him an exemplary candidate for this esteemed position.”

He brings bipartisan support. He was nominated by President Biden, and his nomination has been endorsed by appointees of both President George Bush and President Donald J. Trump. President Bush’s appointee, a senior judge for the U.S. district court of Oregon, called Judge Kasubhai “the very soul of fairness.”

Let me tell you about the judge some things that Oregon has known for more than 30 years. His leadership in the law has been grounded in public service since he served as president of the Student Bar Association at the University of Oregon School of Law.

After graduation, he went into private practice—not in a high-rise downtown, working for a big corporation, but serving ordinary folks in small towns and rural communities in southern and eastern Oregon. He has seen firsthand the day-to-day difficulties working families face in these rural areas.

He brings to the bench a sense of fairness and justice for all. Shouldn’t that be the foundation for a judge, that they really understand the perspective of justice for all—not justice for the powerful, not justice for the billionaires, justice for all?

His service to Oregon and leadership in the law only increased in the following years, serving as a member of the Oregon Workers’ Compensation Board, serving as a judge on the Lane

County Circuit Court until, in 2018, he was elected by the active and senior Federal court judges of the District of Oregon to serve alongside them as a U.S. magistrate judge. When you are elected by other judges, you are a judge’s judge. It says a lot about how highly he is respected.

He was honored in 2022 with the Wallace P. Carson Award for Judicial Excellence, which recognizes those who make exemplary contributions to Oregon’s judiciary.

He is a standout judicial nominee with sterling credentials, an exemplary record, endorsement of law enforcement, and bipartisan support. He has earned the respect and admiration of his peers and colleagues. He is an outspoken champion for justice for all, a fierce believer in our democratic republic, and a passionate defender of the rule of law.

When he visited Washington last fall, he told me he went to the National Archives to, in his words, “pay tribute” to the Constitution. He just wanted to see an original copy of the Constitution directly.

So it is with some pride in his record in Oregon and a substantial amount of admiration for his service to the people of our State and the service he will give to the people of our Nation that I urge my colleagues to support Judge Mustafa Kasubhai to be the next U.S. district judge for the District of Oregon.

## VOTE ON OLER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Oler nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative 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 Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted “nay.”

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 199 Ex.]

## YEAS—52

Baldwin	Carper	Hassan
Bennet	Casey	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Collins	Hickenlooper
Booker	Coons	Hirono
Brown	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Butler	Duckworth	Kelly
Cantwell	Gillibrand	King
Cardin	Graham	Klobuchar

Lujan  
Manchin  
Markey  
Merkley  
Murkowski  
Murphy  
Murray  
Ossoff  
Padilla  
Peters

Reed  
Romney  
Rosen  
Sanders  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Shaheen  
Smith  
Stabenow  
Tester

Tillis  
Van Hollen  
Warner  
Warnock  
Warren  
Welch  
Whitehouse  
Wyden

## NAYS—42

Barrasso  
Blackburn  
Boozman  
Braun  
Britt  
Budd  
Capito  
Cassidy  
Cornyn  
Cotton  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Daines  
Ernst

Fischer  
Grassley  
Hagerty  
Hawley  
Hyde-Smith  
Johnson  
Kennedy  
Lankford  
Lee  
Lummis  
Marshall  
McConnell  
Moran  
Mullin

Paul  
Ricketts  
Risch  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Schmitt  
Scott (FL)  
Scott (SC)  
Sullivan  
Thune  
Tuberville  
Vance  
Wicker  
Young

## NOT VOTING—6

Cramer  
Durbin

Fetterman  
Hoeven

Menendez  
Sinema

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

The majority leader.

## CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the Kasubhai nomination be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Not hearing an objection, it is withdrawn.

The cloture motion was withdrawn.

## UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 870

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and the Chair execute the order of June 13, 2024; further, I ask unanimous consent that the order be modified so that the time until 5:45 p.m. be for debate, equally divided, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

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

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

## FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT OF 2023

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 870) entitled “An Act to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs,” do pass with an amendment and an amendment to the title.

## MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 870.