

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Adam B. Abelson, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

## 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. 705, Adam B. Abelson, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Peter Welch, John W. Hickenlooper, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Laphonza R. Butler, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher A. Coons, Brian Schatz, Sheldon Whitehouse.

## 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. 652.

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 Jeannette A. Vargas, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

## 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. 652, Jeannette A. Vargas, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, John W. Hickenlooper, Sheldon White-

house, Tina Smith, Alex Padilla, Tammy Baldwin, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Gary C. Peters, Peter Welch, Margaret Wood Hassan, Brian Schatz, Jeanne Shaheen.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, August 1, be waived.

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

## JUDICIAL UNDERSTAFFING DELAYS GETTING EMERGENCIES SOLVED ACT OF 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 430, S. 4199.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4199) to authorize additional district judges for the district courts and convert temporary judgeships.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Judicial Understaffing Delays Getting Emergencies Solved Act of 2024" or the "JUDGES Act of 2024".*

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

*Congress finds the following:*

(1) Article III of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to establish judgeships in the district courts of the United States.

(2) Congress has not created a new district court judgeship since 2003 and has not enacted comprehensive judgeship legislation since 1990.

(3) This represents the longest period of time since district courts of the United States were established in 1789 that Congress has not authorized any new permanent district court judgeships.

(4) By the end of fiscal year 2022, filings in the district courts of the United States had increased by 30 percent since the last comprehensive judgeship legislation.

(5) As of March 31, 2023, there were 686,797 pending cases in the district courts of the United States, with an average of 491 weighted case filings per judgeship over a 12-month period.

(6) To deal with increased filings in the district courts of the United States, the Judicial Conference of the United States requested the creation of 66 new district court judgeships in its 2023 report.

## SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT COURTS.

(a) ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIPS.—

(1) 2025.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 1 additional district judge for the central district of California;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the district of Delaware;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Indiana;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Iowa;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the district of New Jersey;

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of New York;

(x) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas; and

(xi) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

“California:

Northern ..... 15

Eastern ..... 7

Central ..... 28

Southern ..... 13”;

(ii) by striking the item relating to Delaware and inserting the following:

“Delaware ..... 5”;

(iii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

“Florida:

Northern ..... 4

Middle ..... 16

Southern ..... 17”;

(iv) by striking the items relating to Indiana and inserting the following:

“Indiana:

Northern ..... 5

Southern ..... 6”;

(v) by striking the items relating to Iowa and inserting the following:

“Iowa:

Northern ..... 3

Southern ..... 3”;

(vi) by striking the item relating to New Jersey and inserting the following:

“New Jersey ..... 18”;

(vii) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

“New York:

Northern ..... 5

Southern ..... 29

Eastern ..... 15

Western ..... 4”;

(viii) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

“Texas:

Northern ..... 12

Southern ..... 20

Eastern ..... 8

Western ..... 13”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2025.

(2) 2027.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 1 additional district judge for the district of Arizona;

(ii) 2 additional district judges for the central district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Florida;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the district of Idaho;

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Texas; and

(x) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to Arizona and inserting the following:

“Arizona ..... 13”;

(ii) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

“California:
Northern ..... 16
Eastern ..... 8
Central ..... 30
Southern ..... 13”;

(iii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

“Florida:
Northern ..... 4
Middle ..... 17
Southern ..... 18”;

(iv) by striking the items relating to Georgia and inserting the following:

“Georgia:
Northern ..... 12
Middle ..... 4
Southern ..... 3”;

(v) by striking the item relating to Idaho and inserting the following:

“Idaho ..... 3”;

(vi) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

“Texas:
Northern ..... 13
Southern ..... 21
Eastern ..... 8
Western ..... 13”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2027.

(3) 2029.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 1 additional district judge for the central district of California;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the district of Colorado;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the district of Delaware;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the district of Nebraska;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of New York;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas;

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Texas; and

(x) 1 additional district judge for the western district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (2) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

“California:
Northern ..... 17
Eastern ..... 9
Central ..... 31
Southern ..... 13”;

(ii) by striking the item relating to Colorado and inserting the following:

“Colorado ..... 8”;

(iii) by striking the item relating to Delaware and inserting the following:

“Delaware ..... 6”;

(iv) by striking the item relating to Nebraska and inserting the following:

“Nebraska ..... 4”;

(v) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

“New York:
Northern ..... 5
Southern ..... 29
Eastern ..... 16
Western ..... 4”;

(vi) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

“Texas:
Northern ..... 13
Southern ..... 22
Eastern ..... 9
Western ..... 14”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2029.

(4) 2031.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 1 additional district judge for the district of Arizona;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the central district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of California;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Florida;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the district of New Jersey;

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the western district of New York; and

(x) 2 additional district judges for the western district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (3) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to Arizona and inserting the following:

“Arizona ..... 14”;

(ii) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

“California:
Northern ..... 18
Eastern ..... 10
Central ..... 32
Southern ..... 14”;

(iii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

“Florida:
Northern ..... 4
Middle ..... 18
Southern ..... 19”;

(iv) by striking the item relating to New Jersey and inserting the following:

“New Jersey ..... 19”;

(v) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

“New York:
Northern ..... 5
Southern ..... 29
Eastern ..... 16
Western ..... 5”;

(vi) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

“Texas:

Northern ..... 13
Southern ..... 22
Eastern ..... 9
Western ..... 16”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2031.

(5) 2033.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 2 additional district judges for the central district of California;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the district of Colorado;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Florida;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of New York;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Texas; and

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the western district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (4) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

“California:
Northern ..... 19
Eastern ..... 10
Central ..... 34
Southern ..... 14”;

(ii) by striking the item relating to Colorado and inserting the following:

“Colorado ..... 9”;

(iii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

“Florida:
Northern ..... 5
Middle ..... 19
Southern ..... 19”;

(iv) by striking the items relating to Georgia and inserting the following:

“Georgia:
Northern ..... 13
Middle ..... 4
Southern ..... 3”;

(v) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

“New York:
Northern ..... 5
Southern ..... 30
Eastern ..... 16
Western ..... 5”;

and
(vi) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

“Texas:
Northern ..... 13
Southern ..... 23
Eastern ..... 9
Western ..... 17”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2033.

(6) 2035.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 2 additional district judges for the central district of California;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Florida;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the district of New Jersey;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of New York;

(viii) 2 additional district judges for the western district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (5) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

“California:	
Northern .....	20
Eastern .....	10
Central .....	36
Southern .....	15”;

(ii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

“Florida:	
Northern .....	5
Middle .....	20
Southern .....	20”;

(iii) by striking the item relating to New Jersey and inserting the following:

“New Jersey .....	20”;
-------------------	------

(iv) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

“New York:	
Northern .....	5
Southern .....	30
Eastern .....	17
Western .....	5”;

(v) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

“Texas:	
Northern .....	13
Southern .....	23
Eastern .....	9
Western .....	19”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2035.

(b) TEMPORARY JUDGESHIPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(A) 2 additional district judges for the eastern district of Oklahoma; and

(B) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Oklahoma.

(2) VACANCIES NOT FILLED.—The first vacancy in the office of district judge in each of the offices of district judge authorized by this subsection, occurring 5 years or more after the confirmation date of the judge named to fill the temporary district judgeship created in the applicable district by this subsection, shall not be filled.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect on January 21, 2025.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section—

(A) for each of fiscal years 2025 and 2026, \$12,965,330;

(B) for each of fiscal years 2027 and 2028, \$23,152,375;

(C) for each of fiscal years 2029 and 2030, \$32,413,325;

(D) for each of fiscal years 2031 and 2032, \$42,600,370;

(E) for each of fiscal years 2033 and 2034, \$51,861,320; and

(F) for fiscal year 2035 and each fiscal year thereafter, \$61,122,270.

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—For each fiscal year described in paragraph (1), the amount au-

thorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year shall be increased by the percentage by which—

(A) the Consumer Price Index for the previous fiscal year, exceeds

(B) the Consumer Price Index for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year described in subparagraph (A).

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “Consumer Price Index” means the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items, United States city average), published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

#### SEC. 4. ORGANIZATION OF UTAH DISTRICT COURTS.

Section 125(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking “and St. George” and inserting “St. George, Moab, and Monticello”.

#### SEC. 5. ORGANIZATION OF TEXAS DISTRICT COURTS.

Section 124(b)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (3), by inserting “and College Station” before the period at the end.

#### SEC. 6. ORGANIZATION OF CALIFORNIA DISTRICT COURTS.

Section 84(d) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and El Centro” after “at San Diego”.

#### SEC. 7. GAO REPORTS.

(a) JUDICIAL CASELOADS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and make publicly available reports—

(1) evaluating—

(A) the accuracy and objectiveness of case-related workload measures and methodologies used by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for district courts of the United States and courts of appeals of the United States;

(B) the impact of non-case-related activities of judges of the district courts of the United States and courts of appeals of the United States on judicial caseloads; and

(C) the effectiveness and efficiency of the policies of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts regarding senior judges; and

(2) providing any recommendations of the Comptroller General with respect to the matters described in paragraph (1).

(b) DETENTION SPACE.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on an assessment of—

(1) a determination of the needs of Federal agencies for detention space;

(2) efforts by Federal agencies to acquire detention space; and

(3) any challenges in determining and acquiring detention space.

#### SEC. 8. PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY OF THE ARTICLE III JUDGESHIP RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States, shall make publicly available on their website, free of charge, the biennial report entitled “Article III Judgeship Recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States”.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report described in subsection (a) should be released not less frequently than biennially and contain the summaries and all related appendices supporting the judgeship recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States, including—

(1) the process used by the Judicial Conference in developing the recommendations;

(2) any caseload and methodology changes;

(3) judgeship surveys with recommendations; and

(4) specific information about each court for which the Judicial Conference recommends additional judgeships.

(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives copies of the report described in subsection (a).

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 4199), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, Madam President, something very good just happened. I am very happy the Senate ends this busy week on another productive note. The Senate just unanimously passed the JUDGES Act.

The goal of the JUDGES Act is in the name. It creates 66 new Federal district court judges in order to relieve our overburdened judiciary. And I want to thank Senator COONS on the Democratic side and Senator YOUNG on the Republican side for their good work in pushing this bill forward.

Today, our Federal courts simply can't keep up with the immense workload like they used to in the past. As our country has kept growing and growing, our Federal courts, sadly, have not kept pace.

The last time we systematically increased Federal judges in America was 1991. We have roughly 80 million more Americans living today than there were back then, so clearly our Federal judiciary desperately needs more capacity. This bill provides it.

Specifically, the JUDGES Act adds 66 new judges over the next six Congresses, starting in 2025, adding 11 at a time.

This bill was unanimously reported out of the Judiciary Committee 20 to 0. There is broad consensus we need more judges on the Federal bench. It is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It also reflects the recommendation of the Judicial Conference for increasing the number of judges.

This is a very responsible, bipartisan, and prudent bill. As I said, our population has increased, and the litigiousness, if you will, of our society has increased, so there is a desperate need for new judges.

I hope the House passes the JUDGES Act very soon, because it is bipartisan; it is prudent; it is responsible. Equal justice under law can't always be counted on if their Federal bench is stretched beyond capacity.

Equal justice can't be counted on if you have to wait years and years to

hear a case, to get a verdict, and so many other parts of the judicial process.

So I call upon our colleagues in the House to move this bill through their Chamber, because the result will be a better functioning judiciary. Right now, people have to wait far too long to hear their cases in court. This should reduce that wait.

Thank you to Senator COONS and Senator YOUNG again for their excellent work in getting this bipartisan bill done.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want to file the No Kings Act, which deals with the horrible Supreme Court decision which gave immunity to future Presidents, and so I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4973

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as I said, this is just putting on the calendar, rule XIV'ing the No Kings Act, which deals with the awful Supreme Court decision that basically allows Presidents to do what they want as long as they can call it official.

I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4973) to reassert the constitutional authority of Congress to determine the general applicability of the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent to resume executive session.

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

The Senate will resume executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am here for the 34th scheme speech on the right-wing billionaires' covert scheme to capture and control our Supreme Court.

And I am here to report real progress in our work to restore the integrity of

the Court, and wrest it from special-interest control.

This Court, captured and corrupted by right-wing special interests, has imposed deeply unpopular and harmful policies on the American people. It needs reform. And—good news—commonsense reforms to take back the Supreme Court received a significant boost from the President and the Vice President this week.

The right-wing "Fed Soc" Justices have done unprecedented damage to America's democratic institutions and to our government's ability to protect ordinary Americans' health, safety, and well-being.

The right-wing Fed SOC Justices also took away women's right to an abortion, leaving millions of women unable to make basic decisions about their own reproductive health and endangering women experiencing troubled pregnancies.

They overturned longstanding and overwhelmingly popular gun safety laws leaving our communities exposed to the epidemic of gun violence.

They eviscerated the government's ability to fight climate change and to protect consumers from corporate profiteering, and they invented, out of thin air, the idea that former Presidents are absolutely immune from being held accountable for using their office to break the law, to commit crimes, even to commit treason.

On top of all of this, the Court has done its best to prevent the American people from fighting back through the democratic process. It has made it harder for ordinary people to vote, while making it easier for billionaires and deep-pocketed special interests to impose their will on the American people with unlimited amounts of dark money.

How did we get here? A decades-long scheme led by creepy billionaires and backed by a deluge of dark money captured the Court like some crooked 19th-century railroad commission. This Court-capture operation was not cheap. The latest estimate put it at more than \$580 million, and that is a minimum. That money flowed in from creepy billionaires, laundered through rightwing front groups like the Federalist Society and Judicial Crisis Network, where the donors—the real donors—could hide their identities behind the front groups doing their dirty work.

This dark money funded full-scale campaigns to stack the Supreme Court with Justices who would deliver for the billionaires. The scheme's major victory came when Senate Republicans blocked Merrick Garland's confirmation to the Supreme Court. That set the stage for Donald Trump to fill that seat through a process outsourced almost entirely to the billionaires' operative Leonard Leo and his array of rightwing, dark money front groups.

Once these handpicked nominees landed on the Court, the dark money network tells them how to rule, supplying them with extremist legal argu-

ments through so-called friend-of-the-court briefs designed to reach their desired results. The parallel between what the friend-of-the-court brief floras recommend and what the FedSoc Justices do is nearly perfect.

Leo and his cronies also orchestrated a secret gifts program for their amenable Justices, keeping them happy with lavish gifts of luxury vacations and other high-value freebies. Despite a clear Federal ethics law requiring Supreme Court Justices to disclose even small gifts, these Justices kept hidden years of free private jet travel, free yacht trips, free tickets to sporting events, and even, for one Justice, \$260,000 of loan forgiveness for a luxury motor coach.

Justices have flouted the Federal law requiring recusal from cases where they have a conflict of interest. Justice Thomas sat on cases involving efforts to overturn the 2020 election despite his wife's involvement in efforts to overturn the 2020 election.

Worst of all, the Court has refused to take any real steps to clean up this mess. After substantial public pressure, it first wrote a useless letter about ethics, and then it adopted a toothless ethics code with no mechanism for either investigation or determination or enforcement.

The Supreme Court now stands alone in all of government free from any factfinding about ethical misconduct. As a result, the Court's legitimacy in the eyes of the American people is now at an alltime low and falling.

Well, against all that mess, earlier this week, something big happened. On Monday, President Biden and Vice President HARRIS endorsed two commonsense proposals to help restore the Court's legitimacy. Happily, I have bills that perfectly align with both.

First, the Supreme Court needs a binding, enforceable code of conduct. The Supreme Court should not violate one of the most basic principles of the law: "Nemo iudex in causa sua"—"No one should be a judge in their own cause." Yes, that is a principle so old and so venerated that it is in Latin, and they violate it nonstop.

The Justices of the Supreme Court should have ethics rules at least as strict as the other branches of government, with a real process for finding out what happened and holding miscreants accountable. Overwhelmingly, Americans agree.

Last week, Justice Kagan suggested that a panel of experienced lower court judges could review ethics complaints, compile a report, and then make recommendations to the Supreme Court. That is exactly what my Supreme Court Ethics, Recusal, and Transparency Act would do.

By the way, that is also what most all State supreme courts do. They all face the same problem of being the top supreme court in their sovereign entity, and they all face ethics review by other judges or panels. This is a solvable problem.