I am going to touch on one other section of the Intelligence authorization bill that concerns me, but I will say that I supported that emergency authority very strongly. I was the first to propose it in 2013. I did so because I said I wanted to make sure—since I am one of the longer serving members of the Intelligence Committee, and I am very pleased to have the Presiding Officer of the Senate on it—and I wanted to be able to say that my focus has been to show that security and liberty are not mutually exclusive. We can do both. I think, with what we have outlined this afternoon, we can, in fact, do both. That is why section 102 of the USA Freedom Act is so important. It spells out how and when the well-being and safety of the American people is on the line. There isn't anybody going to be dawdling around. What the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee said about people waiting for a month to get a national security letter is not going to happen—not if you use section 102. We are making it clear how important security is. But we are also saying that we are not going to needlessly erode these sacred and vital constitutional protections of the American people, which is what you would be doing if a field office of the FBI, administratively and without court oversight, could go out and scoop up scores of browsing records.

That is why I have objected to giving unanimous consent to the intelligence authorization bill. We always do it publicly. That is why I am on the floor tonight.

I will tell my colleagues that this bill, on the key issue of national security letters, is essentially a redo of the vote that took place last week on the McCain legislation.

I close by saying that while the Intelligence authorization bill does contain other provisions that I think are quite constructive, I am troubled that the bill also would erode the jurisdiction of the independent privacy board for the second year in a row. Here, in particular, is where we all want to concentrate on U.S. persons. That is what is so important—focusing on U.S. persons. At a time when telecommunications systems around the world are beginning to merge—and this will increasingly be the case in the digital domain—the individual's U.S. or non-U.S. status is not always readily apparent. So I am concerned about some of the restrictions that are in the authorization, as well that I think they really ignore the way in which telecommunications systems have changed around the world and the difficulty in recognizing quickly an individual's U.S. or non-U.S. status.

With that, I note our friend and colleague is on the floor to give his remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate the always good insight from the senior Senator from Oregon, my colleague on the Finance Committee. I say thank you to Senator WYDEN.

WHOLE WOMAN'S HEALTH V. HELLERSTEDT SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today, the Supreme Court, despite lacking an important ninth Justice—my Republican colleagues refuse to do their jobs. That is the first time that anybody can remember, maybe in history—certainly in recent history—where a Supreme Court nominee has been sent to the Senate by a President, and the Senate has refused to do either hearings or certainly refuse to bring that Justice up for a vote. If this continues, if Senator MCCONNELL and his Republican colleagues continue their course, this will be the first time in 150 years where a Supreme Court vacancy has stayed open for an entire year. Why 150 years? Because we were in the middle of the Civil War, and there were all kinds of things going on as southerners, who had seceded, left the Supreme Court with lots of vacancies, and the Senate didn't do its job then. But that was the Civil War; this is a political war waged by one side in a refusal to do its job.

Today the Supreme Court, despite not having nine members, reaffirmed that women, not politicians, should be the ones making their own health care decisions. In a 5-to-3 decision, the Supreme Court ruled on Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt that the Texas law at issue places an undue burden on a woman's ability to access safe and legal health care.

The law's arbitrary, medically unnecessary—medically unnecessary—restrictions caused dozen of clinics to close across the State of Texas. The same thing has happened in other States with similar laws, including my State of Ohio with 11 million people. These clinics are often the only places that women, and also many men, have to turn to for basic health services. Today's decision is a victory for health care in Texas and, ultimately, for State after State across the country.

Millions of women rely on Planned Parenthood and other clinics like it for lifesaving screenings, testing, preventive care, and treatment. In Ohio, Planned Parenthood centers provide health care services to almost 100,000 men and women each year. A hundred thousand men and women depend on Planned Parenthood for things like screenings, testing, preventive care, and treatment. Many of these men and women have nowhere else to turn. They either can't afford care anywhere else or they live too far away from another health center to have real access to basic health care—screenings, testing, preventive care, counseling, treatment, and all those things.

Today's decision sets an important precedent that no politician should come between a woman and the health care she needs. We know that laws like this are part of a sustained, coordinated attack on a women's right to make personal, private health care decisions for themselves. We have seen it in Ohio, and we have seen it in so many other States across the country.

Politicians claim these harmful restrictions are all about protecting women's health. Nothing could be further from the truth. These talking points are a sham, and today's majority decision by a generally conservative Supreme Court shows the Court saw right through those arguments.

Ohio and other States with so-called TRAP laws should repeal them immediately. If they wait, they will only be struck down by the Court, just like the Texas law—again, a Court where most of those Justices, or at least half of those Justices were appointed by conservative Presidents. We need to work to get these laws off the books quickly and to fight the attacks women continue to face on their right to make their own health care decisions.

Earlier this year, Ohio passed a new law to strip Federal funding not only from Planned Parenthood but any health care facility that could be perceived as ''promoting'' safe and legal abortions. This includes health clinics that simply work with other providers to refer women to other facilities so women can make decisions that should be between them and their doctors.

This is far, far more sweeping than just defunding Planned Parenthood, which is a political talking point for Republicans across this country now. Health officials in Ohio are scared that the new law could take funding away from local health departments—as if we don't have enough problems in our State.

Let's be clear. This isn't about defunding abortion. The Federal government does not provide funding for abortion, period. It hasn't provided funding for abortion for decades. This Ohio law explicitly targets critical health and health education services for women, including HIV testing and cancer prevention services.

Today's 5-to-3 decision by the Supreme Court is a victory for all of us who want to improve the lives and health of women around the country, but it will do nothing to stop laws like this in Ohio. That is why our work goes on.

These laws that have passed in Texas and Ohio that the Court struck down are not about health or safety. The Supreme Court confirmed that today. They are about politicians thinking they know better than women and their doctors, and it is happening every day in this country. If these laws continue to chip away—or in the case of Ohio's new law, carve away—women's access to care, we will see more undiagnosed cancers, more untreated illnesses, and more unintended pregnancies.

My State, shamefully, is 50th in the Nation in Black infant mortality. We are 47th in the Nation overall in infant

mortality. It is laws like these that legislators passed—laws defunding public health services, laws cutting money for local communities so they can put it into health care and education. It is the behavior of this legislature and some of its predecessor legislatures that have attacked young mothers and young women who may or may not be pregnant. And when you do that, there is simply not the emphasis on well-baby care, there is not the emphasis on preventive care, there is not the emphasis on the health of the mother, and there is not the emphasis on giving women choices.

It is time for politicians in my State and across the country to follow the guidance of the Supreme Court today and to stay out of decisions that should be confidentially between a woman and her doctor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:57 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 28, 2016, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 27, 2016:

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT F. ROSSITER, JR., OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA.