

or the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association, individually or jointly, as appropriate.”

(c) **AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL TRANSFERS.**—Section 4 of the Apex Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-67; 103 Stat. 171) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “Clark County” and inserting “Clark County, the City, or the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association, individually or jointly, as appropriate,”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **MINERAL MATERIALS SALE.**—Notwithstanding the requirements of part 3600 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Apex Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act Amendments Act), the Secretary may sell, at not less than fair market value, without advertising or calling for bids and without regard to volume or time limitations, mineral materials resulting from grading, land balancing, or other activities on the surface of a parcel of land within the Apex Site for which the United States retains an interest in the minerals.”

(d) **ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—Section 6 of the Apex Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-67; 103 Stat. 173) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS.**—Each transfer by the United States of land or interest in lands within the Apex Site or rights-of-way issued pursuant to this Act shall be conditioned on the compliance with applicable Federal land laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).”

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

The bill (S. 1760), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### UTAH WILDFIRE RESEARCH INSTITUTE ACT OF 2023

A bill (S. 2151) to amend the Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act of 2004 to require the establishment of an additional Institute under that Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The bill (S. 2151) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2151

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Utah Wildfire Research Institute Act of 2023”.

#### SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL INSTITUTE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5(b)(2) of the Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act of 2004 (16 U.S.C. 6704(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) the State of Utah.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 5(e)(1) of the Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act of 2004 (16 U.S.C. 6704(e)(1)) is amended by striking “and Colorado” and inserting “Colorado, and Utah”.

#### PROHIBITING THE USE OF AMOUNTS FROM THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND TO IMPLEMENT A CERTAIN RECORD OF DECISION

A bill (S. 5000) to prohibit the use of amounts from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund to implement a certain record of decision, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### SECTION 1. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING TO ADDRESS POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF A CERTAIN RECORD OF DECISION ON THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, and the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration, in consultation with the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Working Group, shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to explore and address the potential impact that the record of decision entitled the “Supplement to the 2016 Glen Canyon Dam Long-Term Experimental and Management Plan Record of Decision” and dated July 2024 (referred to in this section as the “record of decision”) may have on the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (referred to in this section as the “Fund”).

(b) **REQUIRED PLAN.**—The memorandum of understanding entered into under subsection (a) shall, using information derived from existing contracts, include the establishment of a plan—

(1) to explore and address the effects that the record of decision may have on the contents of the Fund;

(2) to analyze and address the longer-term impact that the record of decision may have on hydropower production at Glen Canyon Dam; and

(3) to protect the Colorado River Basin and any species listed as a threatened species or an endangered species under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) in the Colorado River Basin from the effects of invasive species and sustained drought.

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

The bill (S. 5000), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The committee-reported title amendment was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to provide for a memorandum of understanding to address the impacts of a certain record of decision on the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund.”

The title of the bill (S. 5000), as amended, was agreed to.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I want to talk about two of the bills that we just passed unanimously today, and I want to thank my colleagues for passing them through UC. They are important pieces of legislation to Nevada. They are S. 1760, the Apex Area Technical Corrections Act, and S. 2042, the Sloan Canyon Conservation and Horizon Lateral Water Pipeline Act.

The first one, the Apex Area Technical Corrections Act, will streamline

the permitting process for new and existing businesses in the Apex Industrial Park in southern Nevada, creating new, good-paying jobs and supporting business growth in North Las Vegas.

I have been to the Apex Industrial Park, and I have seen firsthand the incredible opportunities there. We need to cut redtape and make it easier for new businesses to open their doors and hire hard-working Nevadans. The passage of this legislation today in the Senate will help get us on that path.

The second piece of legislation, which is the Sloan Canyon Conservation and Horizon Lateral Water Pipeline Act, will upgrade the outdated water infrastructure, protecting the water supply for more than 1 million people in southern Nevada.

Right now, almost 40 percent of Las Vegas is served with one water pipeline. A new, updated pipeline will improve the reliability capacity of the existing water system without pulling any more water from Lake Mead. This bill also expands the Sloan Canyon National Conservation Area by more than 9,000 acres, growing this increasingly popular recreation site by almost 20 percent of its existing size.

These necessary improvements will make Nevada’s water infrastructure more sustainable and will protect the water supply for generations to come in southern Nevada.

Again, I thank my colleagues for joining me in passing these two pieces of legislation by unanimous consent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

NOMINATION OF ADEEL A. MANGI

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise today to give a speech that I have never given before. It is really important that I do it on the Senate floor, but it is like I have never done it before because I am actually giving a speech to two young children who may not watch this for years, but I want them to hear it from me. These are two young boys—Azmir and Zaaran—and I write them. I give a sort of open speech to them tonight, really out of joy and faith that is untroubled by my hurt and my sadness.

You see, I think something about this country that so many people have come to know who have seen the worst of America but still love America. They know how these emotions sit side by side—that you could hold sadness and joy next to faith in this Nation, even though there is disappointment. And what I rise to talk to these two young boys about is their dad.

Their dad is a man named Adeel Mangi. He is an extraordinary man. I have met many people from New Jersey, but this man was so extraordinary that the President of the United States of America chose him, because of his qualifications, to be a justice on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. That was why he was chosen. But he also happened to be a glass ceiling breaker; he also happened to be somebody who

was going to make American history as the first ever Muslim judge—a man of Muslim faith—to be on the circuit court.

Now, this is extraordinary that it is 2024 and we have never had someone of the Muslim faith, especially because we are a nation that says there are no religious tests; that we are found on this ideal of religious freedom—but somehow, with the millions of American Muslims and with Muslims being here at our founding and all through American history and with Muslims fighting in every war in American history, we have never had a Muslim ascend to the circuit courts.

I would like to read from a letter that your father wrote. It is really powerful. I wish I could read the whole thing.

I ask unanimous consent that the whole letter by Adeel A. Mangi be printed in the official RECORD of the U.S. Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 16, 2024.

President JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BIDEN: I write to thank you for nominating me to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. There is now no pathway to confirmation for any appellate nominees given the deal struck in the Senate “to save coveted appellate [seats]” for the next administration. But before I go, I have a few things to say. What I set forth here are my individual opinions.

In 1957, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a Republican, spoke at the inauguration of a mosque in Washington, D.C. He said: “And I should like to assure you, my Islamic friends, that under the American Constitution, under American tradition, and in American hearts, this Center, this place of worship, is just as welcome as could be a similar edifice of any other religion. Indeed, America would fight with her whole strength for your right to have here your own church and worship according to your own conscience. This concept is indeed a part of America, and without that concept we would be something else than what we are.”

It was that vision of America that led me, 25 years ago, to make it my home. I saw in America a country where I could succeed based on my professional skill, hard work, and character—regardless of my faith or background. For years, in my work defending the civil rights of the LGBTQ+ community, or working with massive inter-faith coalitions on amicus briefs, I celebrated an America where we stand up for each other. And while I was successful in private practice as a commercial trial lawyer, I had no second thoughts when offered an opportunity to serve my adopted country. Nothing could be a greater privilege.

When my nomination then came before the Senate Judiciary Committee, I was prepared to answer any questions about my qualifications, philosophy, or legal issues. I received none. Instead, I was asked questions about Israel, whether I supported Hamas, and whether I celebrated the anniversary of 9-11. Even more revealing, however, was the tone. The underlying premise appeared to be that because I am Muslim, surely I support terrorism and celebrate 9-11. When I made clear that all these claims are false—that I condemn the Hamas attacks and all forms of terrorism, and indeed that it was my city

that was attacked on 9-11—the next Republican Senators up just repeated their performative outrage. There were children in the audience.

The pretext for these questions was that I had agreed to serve on an outside advisory panel for an academic center that was being established at a preeminent New Jersey Law School to combat bigotry and discrimination, including Islamophobia. I attended four meetings over four years where I focused on areas of academic research that could support civil rights litigation. Yet Senators sought to attribute to me the views of individuals that I do not know at university speaker events that I never even heard of. Muslims in America recognize well these sort of guilt-by-association attacks. Thereafter, advertisements were run deeming me an antisemite, a radical, and a terrorist sympathizer. Horrifying images were published with the Hamas flag substituted for my eyes or interspersing my face with footage of the twin towers on fire. And all of this, even while major Jewish organizations across the country condemned these attacks, ranging from the National Council of Jewish Women to the Anti-Defamation League, and over a dozen more. One of the largest Jewish groups put it this way: “Adeel Mangi, was questioned aggressively on thin pretext about his views on Israel, terrorism, and antisemitism, turning these serious issues into a tool of partisan attack. . . . American Jewish Committee (AJC) has joined several U.S. Supreme Court briefs led by Mangi and find him to be an able jurist, a person of integrity, champion of pluralism, and adversary of discrimination against any group.”

These attacks nonetheless continued endlessly for a simple reason. As Senator Whitehouse revealed on the Senate floor, this was an organized smear campaign fueled by dark money. But it did not end there. After Jewish groups came to my defense, these same attackers pivoted focus to a new absurdity, claiming that I supported the killing of police officers—silently underpinned, in my view, by the notion that as a Muslim I surely support violence, including against law enforcement. What was the ostensible basis for this ludicrous claim? I successfully litigated a landmark pro bono lawsuit—the Karl Taylor case—on behalf of the family of a mentally-ill incarcerated Black man who we alleged was choked to death by corrections officers after having been handcuffed. We secured a precedent-setting resolution that compensated the family and ensured cameras and microphones would be installed to make incarcerated persons and officers safer. My colleagues and I then agreed to serve on an advisory panel, which never met or had any responsibilities, for the not-for-profit organization that referred that case to my law firm, to provide legal advice on future similar pro bono cases that might arise involving suspicious deaths in prisons. In the event, we brought no other cases. This pro bono legal service aimed at enforcing the law apparently was enough for attackers to deem me an opponent of law enforcement.

As I detailed in a letter, this twisted attack—again based on outright lies, the actions of a person I never even met, or speaker events that I never heard of—is shocking and false. I am proud to have the support of a dozen police organizations, a group of Attorneys General from around the country, and a bipartisan group of current and former New Jersey Attorneys-General and U.S. Attorneys. Law enforcement groups that spoke to me before taking a position supported me. But others repeated slander without speaking to me. Some of those opposing police groups later did speak to me and then openly recognized that the attacks against me were wrong—and yet were instructed by their

leadership not to get involved. Meanwhile, history has recorded who raised a fist of solidarity to the protestors that later attacked law enforcement officers in our nation’s capital on January 6, 2021. And which lawmakers support them still.

Amidst all of this, countless additional and spurious online assaults were launched on a regular basis from within the extremist ecosystem; the staff of the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee took the extraordinary step of demanding information from my partners and my law firm; volleys were launched against even my private sector clients; and Senators, led by the Minority Leader himself, launched regular attacks on me online and on the Senate floor as an antisemite radical. I was even attacked for board service with the New York Legal Aid Society.

What can explain all of this? One commentator recounted my professional accomplishments and then observed: “But he also successfully fought efforts by two New Jersey communities to prevent the construction of mosques. He has served on the board of directors of the Muslim Bar Association and Muslims for Progressive Values. Clearly, he’s both an accomplished attorney and a proud representative of his religion. That’s what his Republican critics can’t tolerate. They will never accept someone who is so prominently associated with Islam.” Meanwhile, here is what it was not about: throughout this entire process, I was never criticized by anyone for a single statement that I ever uttered or a single word that I ever wrote.

I accepted these farcical attacks with the silence demanded of judicial nominees in service of my country. Others were not silent. Senator Booker eviscerated these attacks in an extraordinary and passionate address. They were condemned by almost 50 pro bono partners and chairs at leading law firms and legal organizations, over 125 civil rights groups, and dozens of bar associations. They were meticulously exposed in many newspapers, including two op-eds in the New York Times (first and second) and in the New Yorker. A historical parallel was drawn in The Atlantic to the attacks on Thurgood Marshall, and the attack campaign was decried in columns by prominent Muslim Americans, e.g., on CNN and MSNBC, and by Jewish Americans. My home-state newspaper of record in New Jersey, The Star Ledger, wrote five editorials: “GOP to NJ judge pick: Muslims need not apply”; “Ugly lies about antisemitism and terrorism: GOP smears NJ judge pick”; “Cowering in the face of anti-Muslim bigotry: Shame on Democrats.”; “First bigotry, now lies: This judge pick deserves better”; and “A MAGA judge for N.J.? You can thank Democrats.” A highly-respected Republican-appointed former judge of the Third Circuit wrote and spoke out in my support. And these attacks were demolished by John Oliver who concluded: “As with the Islamophobic attacks on Mangi, the evidence that he is somehow antipolice are laughably thin. It’s yet more six degree of separation nonsense.” Yet it was three Democratic Senators who surrendered to this campaign.

Two allied Senators from a state far from the Third Circuit announced their opposition ostensibly based on the attacks claiming I am against law enforcement. I will not assume the worst possible motivation for their embrace of this attack. But to me that leaves two possibilities: that these Senators lack the wisdom to discern the truth, which exposes a catastrophic lack of judgment; or they used my nomination to court conservative voters in an election year, which exposes a catastrophic lack of principle. One reportedly made the decision based on fear of an attack ad—and apparently not for the

first time. Meanwhile, a third Senator literally handed control of his vote to Republicans. To fetishize bipartisanship amidst an outrageous attack campaign is not a virtue—it is a preening abandonment of morality. But ultimately, none of these Senators had to reach a final decision and vote. Resurgent efforts after the election towards confirmation were derailed by the deal in the Senate that denied all circuit nominees a vote. My family and I were put through this astonishing prolonged process and yet in the end denied even a vote requiring Senators to show who they are. The strength of the Senate's collective commitment to principle stands revealed.

Our country faces an incoming tsunami of bigotry, hatred, and discrimination. It targets Muslims, Arabs, Jews, Black people, the LGBTQ+ community, and many others. And it always pretends to be something other than what it is. These forces are fueled not only by their proponents, but equally by the collaboration and silence of the spineless. They can be defeated only by those who lead voters with courage, not those who sacrifice principles for votes. But courage can be found outside of politics. American Muslims are part of this nation's fabric and will not cower. This campaign was intended to make it intolerable for Muslims proud of their identity to serve this nation. It will fail. Our Constitution forbids religious tests for any Office of the United States and American Muslims will cherish that fundamental American value, even if others apply it only selectively. And let me be clear: I will always be immensely proud of my faith as well as my pro bono legal work to challenge both denials of freedom of worship and the alleged killing of an incarcerated Black man. I have battled for justice, even if it meant there would be none for me.

This unfortunate fact remains: we have a fundamentally broken process for choosing federal judges. This is no longer a system for evaluating fitness for judicial office. It is now a channel for the raising of money based on performative McCarthyism before video cameras, and for the dissemination of dark-money-funded attacks that especially target minorities. Nominees pay the price—and so too does our nation. Who will give up the rewards of private sector success for public service, if the added price is character assassination and wading through a Senatorial swamp like this one? This process must be reinvented to protect nominees from threats both reputational and physical in an era of Congressional dishonor where disinformation reigns and all decency has been abandoned. I set forth this record of my experience and my opinions so that this playbook will be recognized the next time a Muslim is nominated to a prominent position of service.

Thank you for the principled and steadfast support that the White House nominations team provided to me throughout this process. That team is the embodiment of true and honorable public service. Thank you also for your historic support of exceptional judicial candidates who happen to be from minority communities. I am grateful for the unprecedented coalition of bar associations, lawyers, Attorneys General, unions, mayors, religious groups, civil rights organizations, the City Council of Jersey City, and countless individual citizens, who demanded my confirmation. And I am deeply appreciative of the support I received from minority law enforcement groups around the country, including those in New York and New Jersey, who acted with courage based on facts.

To return to President Eisenhower's words, Americans must now look at the story of this nomination, and ask themselves: is this who we are now? For my children, I hope America one day lives up to President Eisen-

hower's promise, even if not today. For my part, I entered this nomination process as a proud American and a proud Muslim. I exit it the same way, unbowed.

Respectfully Yours,

ADEEL A. MANGI.

Mr. BOOKER. So, here, he writes about his nomination:

When my nomination . . . came before the Senate Judiciary Committee, I was prepared to answer any questions about my qualifications, philosophy, or legal issues, [but] I received none. Instead, I was asked questions about Israel, whether I supported Hamas, and whether I celebrated the anniversary of 9/11. Even more revealing, however, was the tone. The underlying premise appeared to be that because I am Muslim, surely I support terrorism and celebrate 9/11. When I made clear that all these claims are false—that I condemn the Hamas attacks and all forms of terrorism, and indeed that it was my city—[my city]—that was attacked on 9/11—the next Republican Senators up just repeated their performative outrage. There were children in the audience.

These attacks, nonetheless, continued endlessly for a simple reason. As Senator WHITEHOUSE revealed on the Senate floor, this was an organized smear campaign fueled by dark money. But it did not end there. After Jewish groups came to my defense, these same attackers pivoted [their] focus to a new absurdity, claiming that I supported the killing of police officers—silently underpinned, in my view, by the notion that as a Muslim I surely support violence, including against law enforcement.

Now, your father goes on to detail not only how these incredible, outrageous smear attacks were false and that there was no basis for them but how he has actually been someone who has stood up in his legal career in pursuit of justice and has the support of dozens of police organizations, attorneys general from around the country, bipartisan groups of current and former attorneys general, law enforcement groups, and more.

He ends his letter with the conclusion that these tactics succeeded in stopping him from even getting a vote on the Senate floor, from ascending to the Third Circuit, and making history.

Your father—your father—concluded his letter by saying a truth: Our country faces an incoming tsunami of bigotry and hatred and discrimination. It targets Muslims, Arabs, Jews, Black people, the LGBTQ community, and many others.

And this is not in the letter, but I remind people that hate crimes are on the rise across our country.

Azmir and Zaaran, back to your father's letter:

And it always pretends to be something other than what it is. These forces are fueled not only by their proponents, but equally by the collaboration and silence of the spineless. They can be defeated only by those who lead voters with courage, not those who sacrifice principles for votes. But courage can be found outside of politics. American Muslims are part of this nation's fabric and will not cower. This campaign was intended to make it intolerable for Muslims proud of their identity to serve this nation. It will fail. Our Constitution forbids religious tests for any Office of the United States and American Muslims will cherish that fundamental American value, even if others apply it only selectively.

Your father continues:

I have battled for justice, even if it meant there would be none for me.

I read that line, Azmir and Zaaran, and it gave me chills because it reminded me of my own family and stories of people who fought for justice that they would never enjoy. It reminded me of the history in this country when suffrage leaders fought for the vote for Black men, the vote for suffrage for Blacks, and they would not enjoy it as women. It reminds me of so many Americans who still stood up for principles and ideals that our country proclaims, even when they would not enjoy them.

Azmir and Zaaran, your father continues:

This unfortunate fact remains: We have a fundamentally broken process for choosing federal judges. This is no longer a system for evaluating fitness for judicial office. It is now a channel for the raising of money based on performative McCarthyism before video cameras, and for the dissemination of dark-money-funded attacks that especially target minorities. Nominees pay the price—and so . . . does our nation. Who will give up the rewards of private sector success for public service, if the added price is character assassination and wading through a Senatorial swamp like this one? This process must be reinvented to protect nominees from threats both reputational and physical in an era of Congressional dishonor where disinformation reigns and all decency has been abandoned. I set forth this record of my experience and my opinions so that this playbook will be recognized the next time—

And there will be a next time—

a Muslim is nominated to a prominent position of service.

He ends with this:

To return to President Eisenhower's words, Americans must now look at the story of this nomination, and ask themselves: Is this who we are now?

To these two young boys he ends:

For my children, I hope America one day lives up to President Eisenhower's promise, even if not today. For my part, I entered this nomination process as a proud American and a proud Muslim. I exit it the same way, unbowed.

Azmir and Zaaran, I remember this day and the excitement I felt when I walked into that hearing room, this wood-paneled historic chamber. I remember how it signaled to visitors the gravity of the business that was about to be conducted within the walls. And you two were seated in the front row, just behind your dad. I remember the joy that I felt when I saw the two of you, that you were going to witness the ascendancy of your father to the highest court in the land, and you two were going to witness the smashing of a barrier and seeing your father—a proud American, who happens to be a Muslim—become the first.

I remember your smiles. I remember how they made my whole being smile. Your mother sat behind you beaming with pride. I sat on the dais so full of joy. And the hearing began.

I told your dad I didn't know why he asked you to leave the room. I wanted you to stay for the whole hearing. But

your mom and dad, wise beyond me, had you leave. At your young age then, I am glad you did not witness what then transpired. It was shameful. Not for your family, it was shameful for us as Senators. It was shameful for America.

You heard your father detail the remarks and the questions that were so degrading and demeaning. They weren't successful. They couldn't degrade or demean the character of your father, but they were degrading and demeaning—questions that have never been asked in all of American history to a nominee: "Did you support 9/11, the terrorist attacks," that he witnessed. How insulting was that? And they were repeated over and over, demeaning and degrading—attempting to, but your father's character can never be demeaned, can never be degraded because he stood tall on that day.

In the history of this country of so many women and Black men and immigrants and Irish and Italian and Catholics and Asian Americans, Japanese and Chinese who have been insulted and looked down upon and faced bigotry, your father, like generations of other Americans who were told they weren't good enough because they were different, your father stood in the saddle and took the assaults, and he never ever, ever backed down.

Calmly and repeatedly, he answered the inane questions, the darkness directed toward him, and he showed his light.

I would be remiss if I didn't tell you over and over again how brilliant your father is, how he got to that seat. Amidst thousands of talented lawyers across the country, your father stood out to the President of the United States as one of the best. He is a top litigator. He is cherished by his colleagues.

His legal acumen and intellect were part of the reasons I recommended him because all throughout my State, on both sides of the aisle, people told me how amazing your father was, how talented your father was, how this was a layup for the court, how he would elevate the judiciary.

And what people said about him wasn't just his legal acumen; they also talked about your dad's character—a man who lives by his principles, how he even stood up to the government when it was discriminating against others because they were different, how he represented people who had no one to stand up for their values.

He stood up for a man named Karl Taylor, who was held in prison and beaten to death by correctional officers. Not only did your dad win that lawsuit for Mr. Taylor's family, but he helped protect other incarcerated people in New York by having all the prisons agree to install video cameras to stop attacks like that one from ever happening again to protect other lives.

Your father has this unrelenting commitment to the ideal of fairness

and justice. He has modeled his life after that. He doesn't just believe these things, he acts in accordance with them.

New Jersey is lucky to have him on our State bar, and we would have been lucky to have him on the Third Circuit.

My mom said something about me that I think is funny. My mom says:

Behind every successful child is an astonished parent.

But I will never be surprised by the two of you. I think you two, knowing your parents, are going to grow up to be extraordinary lightworkers in this Nation.

James Baldwin said:

Children are never good at listening to their elders, but they never fail to imitate them.

I have this faith in the two of you. And the reason why I am doing this, standing on the Senate floor talking to two New Jersey children, teenage boys, 14 and 13, the reason why I am talking to you is because I know who you are, with only meeting you on that day, because you were raised by these modeled citizens, by these great Americans whose character shines amidst the darkness of the storm that your family just went through.

Your father was professionally attacked. For months and months and months, he was trolled on the internet. He faced streams of hate as people built entire million-dollar campaigns to try to discredit him. Yet your dad and your mom never faltered and never flinched, told the President of the United States that they would continue in the process if the President believed that it was still possible for him to serve his Nation.

It is these attributes of your parents that I know live in you. I guess I want you all never to stop believing like your parents do and not just the attributes that mark your family and distinguish it but in those attributes of our Nation that we can never stop believing in.

This great body failed your father. It failed the American people. It is one of the most painful chapters I have had in public life.

The American people deserve a government that just doesn't function in accordance with fairness but upholds the ideals that are so core to this country; that everyone is created equal, that there should be liberty and justice for all.

That is not what happened in this episode. It is not what happened to your dad. He was treated differently because of his faith. Bigotry was used to attempt to demean him. Lies were used to discredit him. The broken political system was used to dissuade and intimidate people from standing up for him.

It was a dark moment in the Senate's history, I tell you this. But your father, whose character I believed in before the process, has shown a character that inspires me now more than ever.

I want to ask you two to never stop believing in the ideals of this Nation because it is why your father is who he is. Your parents told me their fealty to America, their love of this country, has not faltered. It is this great tradition of people who love America so much, even when America doesn't love them back. It is people in this country, from McCarthyism to the bigotry and hate of slavery, who kept working to change this country and make it better.

I ask the two of you to embrace your parents' way, to love America, to believe in her, and to know that this Nation needs you and your family.

I believe sometimes we have the most difficult moments to make way for better days ahead. I believe in people and their potential and ability to make a difference.

We are in a moment right now where too many leaders in our country subscribe to a politics of division. We are in a moment where we are seeing a rise of hate. I think it is an inflection point, and I think this is the point—and perhaps yours is the generation—to take our Nation in a better direction.

I believe, in many ways, your dad's steadfast love of country and the fact that he is unbowed by this process, I think that that is, in many ways, the foundation that is going to help us as a nation go forward.

I want to end with a poem my parents read me. I told your dad—and I got emotional when I talked to him earlier today—that when I looked at the two of you, I saw my brother and me.

Cary and I were raised by two parents, the first ever to integrate an all-White neighborhood. My parents faced the same kind of awful indignities as many people who are different in that they weren't allowed to buy their house. They had to get a White couple to pose as them—I was just a baby at that time—in order to be the first Black family to move in.

On the day of the closing on the house, when the White couple didn't show up and my father did, and a lawyer—like your father—the real estate agent didn't capitulate; he actually punched the lawyer in the face and sicced a Doberman pinscher on my dad.

We eventually got the owners of the home to sell us the house and moved in, but my parents were conscious my entire childhood that there is hate in this world, there is bigotry in this world. It was the tunnel that you had to come through to be in the very house where you lived. But they never wanted us to stop loving America and loving other people. They wanted us to know that there were going to be times in life when you are going to face hatred and that would never define you. What will define you is how you respond to it.

What your father gave America is a master's class on how to respond to lies, bigotry, and hatred—organized and financed. What your father showed

is, in that darkness, he could bring light.

So my parents wanted me to be like your dad in life; that if I faced the worst bigotry and hate, that I did not stop loving, that I did not stop loving others and loving Americans. And they would find ways to inspire me.

So I want to read you all one of the poems my parents shared with me—not the whole poem but a few sections. It is by a woman named Maya Angelou, and it is a poem called “Still I Rise.”

You may write me down in history  
with your bitter, twisted lies,  
You may trod me in the very dirt  
But still, like dust, I'll rise.  
Just like moons and like suns,  
With the certainty of tides,  
Just like hopes springing high,  
Still I'll rise.  
Out of the huts of history's shame  
I rise  
Up from a past that's rooted in pain  
I rise  
I'm a black ocean, leaping and wide,  
Welling and swelling I bear in the tide.  
Leaving behind nights of terror and fear  
I rise  
Into a daybreak that's wondrously clear  
I rise  
Bringing the gifts that my ancestors gave,  
I am the dream and the hope of the slave.  
I rise  
I rise  
I rise.

To two young men, growing up in a great nation, to Azmir and Zaaran, I rise today to tell you that this is a great nation, to remind you that your father has made it greater, and to tell you that I am full of hope that the two of you will rise up and help our Nation redeem its difficult past and seize for itself an even greater future.

God bless the two of you. In sha' Allah, you two will make America even greater.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

AMERICA'S CONSERVATION ENHANCEMENT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2024

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I understand that the Senate has received the House message to accompany S. 3791.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 3791) entitled “An Act to reauthorize the America's Conservation Enhancement Act, and for other purposes”, do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. BOOKER. I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 3791, and I know of no further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the motion?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 3791.

The motion to concur was agreed to.

Mr. BOOKER. I ask that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

RECOGNIZING THE SECOND COMMEMORATION OF THE ANTI-LGBTQ+ ATTACK THAT OCCURRED ON NOVEMBER 19-20, 2022, AT CLUB Q, AN LGBTQ+ BAR IN COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 895 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 895) recognizing the second commemoration of the anti-LGBTQ+ attack that occurred on November 19-20, 2022, at Club Q, an LGBTQ+ bar in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOKER. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 895) was agreed to.

Mr. BOOKER. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of November 19, 2024, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

AMENDING THE BROADCASTING AND RECORDING PROCEDURES OF THE SENATE

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 934, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 934) amending the broadcasting and recording procedures of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOKER. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing no further debate, the question is on adopting the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 934) was agreed to.

Mr. BOOKER. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

(The resolution is printed in today's (Legislative Day of December 16, 2024) RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

PROVIDING FOR CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 4367

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I now would like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 46.

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

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) providing for corrections in the enrollment of S. 4367.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BOOKER. I ask further that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's (Legislative day of December 16, 2024) RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

FEDERAL AGENCY PERFORMANCE ACT OF 2024

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I understand that the Senate has received the House message to accompany S. 709.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BOOKER. I ask that the chair lay before the body the House message to accompany S. 709.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 709) entitled “An Act to improve performance and accountability in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.”, do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. BOOKER. I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 709.

I know of no further debate on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 709.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BOOKER. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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