

Thune	Warner	Wicker
Tillis	Warnock	Wyden
Tuberville	Warren	Young
Van Hollen	Welch	
Vance	Whitehouse	

NAYS—2

Hawley

Paul

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). On this vote, the yeas are 97, the nays are 2.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

TAX CONVENTION WITH CHILE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty will be stated.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 112-8, TAX CONVENTION WITH CHILE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 136

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 136.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This resolution of ratification shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after ratification.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1999

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, 1 year ago, the rightwing majority of the U.S. Supreme Court overturned decades of established precedent and stripped away the right to abortion in the *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* decision.

In this decision, the Supreme Court overturned the right of the American people to make decisions about their own bodies and their own health. That is why, 1 year ago, I filed the Right to Contraception Act with my colleagues Senators DUCKWORTH, HIRONO, BALDWIN, and MURRAY, and I stood here, much like I am today, to request unanimous consent to pass our legislation. The House of Representatives passed the bill by a bipartisan vote of 220 to 195 at that time. Unfortunately, the Republicans in this Chamber chose to block its passage.

Here is just a short list of what has befallen us since that time.

District court judges have blocked teens from accessing birth control at

federally funded clinics and taken aim at health insurance coverage for contraception. Extremist State legislators have restricted, criminalized, and stigmatized reproductive care, including by suspending payments for emergency contraception for survivors of sexual assault. And people are left paying more, traveling further, and working harder to get essential medication.

The threats to contraception are real and happening now. So I stand here today, once again, to invite every Member of the Senate to join me, Senator DUCKWORTH, Senator HIRONO, Senator BALDWIN, Senator MURRAY, and the 35 additional cosponsors to pass the Right to Contraception Act.

Cosponsoring this bill means that you support codifying the right to obtain and use contraception; enshrining Supreme Court precedent into Federal law, guaranteeing a healthcare provider's right to prescribe these products and services and to share information related to them; preventing the Federal Government and States from interfering with the right to contraception; and authorizing the U.S. Attorney General, healthcare providers, and all Americans harmed by unlawful restrictions to go to court to enforce the rights this bill establishes—because there is no right without a remedy.

Passing the Right to Contraception Act means setting the bare minimum standard that the right to contraception should be protected even if the Supreme Court, once again, overturns settled precedent.

Nine in ten Americans support the right to contraception. This is not just a moral duty but part of our duty to represent the will of the American people. The right to contraception is central to life, liberty, and freedom. This is for every person who wants to live without politicians in their homes and waiting rooms, especially women, Black, Brown, indigenous, LGBTQ+, rural, immigrant, low-income, and disabled Americans most impacted by the failures of this Supreme Court.

With the right to abortion stolen and the right to contraception now threatened, I urge my colleagues to stand with us and to pass today the Right to Contraception Act.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 1999 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill is not about contraception; it is about abortion.

The bill defines "contraception" as "any drug, device, or biological prod-

uct intended for use in the prevention of pregnancy, whether specifically intended to prevent pregnancy or for other health needs, that is approved by the FDA."

The FDA has approved dangerous chemical abortion drugs that can also be used as contraceptives off-label. There is a huge difference between a drug that blocks fertilization and a drug that can end a life.

This bill also includes a provision that would act as a guaranteed earmark for Planned Parenthood. Under the bill, the government could not directly fund a health organization unless it provides abortion drugs.

Finally, this bill does not respect freedom of conscience for healthcare providers. It would no longer allow for religious exemptions for organizations that have deeply held objections to providing abortions.

The bill uses intentionally vague language to hide its ulterior motive of protecting access to abortion drugs. For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. This is an issue that we are going to return to. Justice Thomas, in his comments on the *Dobbs* decision, said that the decisions made by the Supreme Court that extended privacy rights were an overreach. This Supreme Court began with the *Dobbs* decision. It is very clear, because he mentioned it specifically, that the *Griswold* decision—the decision to, in fact, protect the right to contraception—is also now in the crosshairs of the Supreme Court. So it is imperative that we return to this law to begin the process of passing legislation to codify this protection for Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2053

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, this Saturday marks 1 year since the Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade* at the urging of extremist politicians upending 50 years of precedent protecting women's right to healthcare.

In the year since that decision, half the States in our country have banned or effectively banned access to abortion. Women in those States have extremely limited options for getting the healthcare they need. Those who can afford to travel have no choice but to go to other States to receive critical reproductive care.

That is what happened to Lauren Hall. She and her husband were excited that she was pregnant for the first time. But then she learned that her fetus was developing without a skull—a condition that meant it wouldn't survive. This condition also increased Lauren's risk of hemorrhaging. Her doctors at home in Texas refused to help her terminate the pregnancy, so she had to travel to Seattle, where she was finally able to get the abortion care that she needed. She is currently

suing the State of Texas for refusing to give her potentially lifesaving medical care.

We knew that after the Dobbs decision, stories like Lauren's would only happen more often and millions of women would lose the healthcare they need. Even before Roe fell, healthcare organizations in Nevada were prepared for an influx of women from out of State who needed abortion services.

Justice Brett Kavanaugh recognized this too. In his concurring opinion, he indicated that women who have to leave their home State to get the care they need would be protected by the constitutional right to interstate travel.

But we could see from miles away in Nevada that the far right would never stop plotting to roll back women's rights even further. In the last year alone, we have seen extremist Republicans try to stop women in our military from getting the healthcare they need. They have come after safe and effective birth control, and they have even supported a Federal abortion ban to outlaw reproductive care in all 50 States. And now we are seeing far-right extremists actively work to bar women from seeking care in States outside their own.

Let's be clear: This is about controlling women. The far right doesn't trust women to make their own healthcare decisions, so they think those decisions should be made by politicians instead. Well, I don't know about some of my colleagues across the aisle, but I don't think elected officials should be telling women what to do with their bodies, and neither do the vast majority of Nevadans.

We are a proud pro-choice State. Back in 1990, Nevadans overwhelmingly voted to codify a woman's right to choose. And, today, over two-thirds of Nevadans believe that a woman's healthcare decisions are between her and her doctor, and that is across all parties—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

But even though Nevada is a safe place for women who need healthcare, far-right Republicans living outside my State are telling women: Oh, no, sorry. We are making it illegal for you to go there.

This April, Idaho became the first State to make it a criminal offense for someone to help an individual traveling out of State to seek an abortion. And elected officials in States like Tennessee, Texas, and Missouri are trying to punish women for leaving their State for reproductive care, as well as anyone who helps them, including their doctors or even their employers.

This is why my colleagues and I are reintroducing the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act. One year after Roe v. Wade was overturned, we need this bill more than ever. Our legislation reaffirms that women have a fundamental right to interstate travel and makes crystal clear that States cannot prosecute women—or anyone who helps

them—for going to another State to get the critical reproductive care that they need.

We are talking about upholding a constitutional right to allow women to travel outside their home State. Now, why do some of my anti-choice colleagues want to restrict women from moving freely between States? The answer is simple: They don't trust women to have control over their own bodies.

Well, I do. And I am going to keep doing everything in my power to protect women, not just in Nevada but in every State across the country. We must pass the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act.

So, Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 2053 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

MR. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there is an obsession on the left with abortion. It is becoming all-encompassing, infecting conversations that we have in the Senate on everything from the military to the Department of Veterans Affairs to phantom State laws that don't even exist.

Judges have to bow their policy objectives if they want to be appointed in this administration. Or those who are already on the bench, if they don't bow their policy objectives, if they don't bow to the abortion-centric, abortion-obsessed culture on the left, then all of a sudden, they are going to face these baseless attacks to their credibility and even threats of violence.

This bill, properly understood, really should be called the "Freedom to Traffic Act." You see, to my knowledge, no State—not a single State—has enacted a law restricting an adult's right to travel across State lines for purposes of an abortion or otherwise. I am not even aware of a single State considering such a thing.

And if a State were to even consider it, they wouldn't do it. And if they did do it, social law would undoubtedly be struck down as unconstitutional on one of at least several grounds, including the fact that the commerce clause, article I, section 8, clause 3 of Constitution has interpreted by the Supreme Court—among other things—to prohibit any State from treating an article of commerce—including a good, a person, a thing—in interstate commerce differently based on its origin or designation, out of State or outside the United States.

States can't cabin their own residents or anyone inside their own State boundaries. That is well-understood. So they don't have that authority. But more importantly, we are dealing with

a phantom problem, a phantom law that does not exist. There is not a single State law out there that restricts an adult's right to travel out of State for an abortion or otherwise.

What some States do have, and perhaps that is what is causing the confusion here, are some laws to stop the trafficking of children across State lines to obtain an abortion without notifying their parents.

This is well-established. We have laws on the books prohibiting the trafficking of minors across State lines with good reason. This is very different than what was implied as a reason why we need to pass this bill here today. It just isn't true. Those laws don't exist. They are not on the books. They are not even being considered to be placed on the books.

These laws are aimed to stop the sexual abuse of children by prohibiting their adult abusers and those in the abortion industry to help facilitate that abuse by transporting them across State lines for the purpose of obtaining an abortion and thus hiding the fact that they got an abortion from their parents.

There are good reasons for these laws. In 2004, for example, the 14-year-old daughter of Marcia Carroll was taken by her boyfriend's family from their home in Pennsylvania, where they lived, to New Jersey—New Jersey, where parental consent for an abortion was not required at the time. There, once in New Jersey, they threatened to leave her in New Jersey unless she got an abortion, which she did, under duress, under coercion, afraid. The grief and devastation crushed this 14-year-old girl and her family, who had agreed to keep the baby.

This so-called Freedom to Traffic Act would hamper the ability of States to punish such criminal and cowardly actions. I don't think there is anyone here who can defend that—trafficking a child across State lines for purposes of obtaining an abortion.

Sadly, this is not an isolated incident—far from it. We know from undercover videos, testimony from other courageous victims and reports from former employees that Planned Parenthood actively works to hide these child sexual abuse instances—covering up for adult abusers by providing their child victims with abortions and failing to report abuse.

This, again, is another thing that happens. Not only do we distort the facts, not only do we distort the status quo of the law in this country, but we also distort key facts when people become obsessed with abortion, and they see abortion as if it were, somehow, an unmitigated good.

This bill was just barely introduced in the Senate—I believe as recently as yesterday. This bill has not been through any committee. It has not been marked up in the committee of jurisdiction—the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I serve. But Democrats think we should just pass it

anyway. I guess maybe they are channeling the now infamous words of former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI when she said “We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it.”

This isn’t how we legislate, and we certainly shouldn’t be legislating when we haven’t reviewed the bill, it hasn’t been through committee, we don’t know what it says, and the bill’s proponents are badly mischaracterizing what it does and why we need it.

On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, as was already pointed out, the Constitution does protect the right to travel in this country, and there is no doubt that the Supreme Court has made that precedent clear. But constitutional rights don’t enforce themselves. And my colleagues on the far right only cloak themselves in the Constitution when it suits them, and right now, it really doesn’t suit them. That is why far-right Republicans in State legislatures across the country are working on and passing laws specifically focused on restricting a woman’s right to travel for reproductive healthcare—something I noticed my colleague from Utah seemed to ignore—Tennessee, Texas, Missouri, or some of those States.

At the end of the day, let me just touch on this idea that somehow this legislation is focusing on trafficking of individuals for sexual exploitation. Now, again, this is a perfect example of some of the far-right Republicans—when they really can’t argue the facts and the law of something, then they just make things up or they throw inflammatory arguments out there to try to scare individuals.

But let me just make this clear. As a former attorney general who worked and continues to work on human trafficking issues that address the sexual exploitation of adults and minors, this is not trafficking. And I would say to my colleague in Utah, who knows better, that sexual exploitation of individuals that this country needs to address, along with many other countries—and we have passed laws to protect individuals—this is not it.

What I do know is, instead of addressing the true issue before us, which is, why can’t women be free to travel from a State that has restricted their right to abortion to my State, where we have chosen to allow them to get the healthcare they need, the essential healthcare—it is always fascinating to me that I hear, on the far right, my colleagues say it is always about States’ rights; it is about States’ rights; this is a States’ rights issue.

Dobbs basically said in its decision this is a States’ rights issue, but then, when it doesn’t suit what they care about, the far right says: Well, forget those States’ rights. Only listen to what we as elected officials determine

you should have. Ignore what Nevada has done. Ignore the Democrats, the Republicans, the Independents, the men and the women in Nevada who chose to codify the right of a woman to choose and seek essential healthcare. Ignore that completely.

That is what this legislation is about. It is about trusting women and giving them the ability to come to a State like Nevada to seek essential healthcare for their reproductive rights.

Again, I constantly hear this emotional argument about—and my colleague from Utah, whom I respect, but he said this—the left somehow has an obsession with abortion. It is outrageous, outrageous, inflammatory talk. What we do have an obsession with is freedom and that every American in this country, whether you are a man or a woman, should have that freedom, and it shouldn’t be taken away from you by elected officials who think they know better about your healthcare than you do, who think that they can restrict in their State your access to healthcare, that they can jeopardize your healthcare and your decisions about your family and your future because they think they know better.

Mr. President, I just think it is outrageous that one simple thing that we cannot agree to in this Congress in a bipartisan way is that women should have that fundamental freedom to travel for their healthcare needs without being restricted, without being called names, without being fearful, and we should be protecting those doctors and the healthcare decisions to do that.

I will say one final thing. We have worked hard in this country to evolve so that all our medical care is some of the best. We are fighting right now to make sure that we have access to technology, that we have access to medical care. We do the research. We do the development. We have the medical care of the 21st century.

What my far-right Republicans are telling women across this country is, you can’t access that medical care for the 21st century. Do you know why? Because we think that we should hold you back to the 19th century. We want to politicize this, and we want to take away your rights, and so we are going to take you back to the 19th century.

It is outrageous—outrageous that we have to be here in this day and age. Over 50 years of *Roe v. Wade* and not one issue that we can see impeding anybody’s rights here, for women across this country and this fundamental freedom about reproductive rights.

So I am disappointed, but I will tell you what, Mr. President, this is an issue you are going to see all of us, one after another, continue to fight. This is an essential fight for women in this country and their rights and their freedom to choose—the freedom to choose and not have somebody else dictate what they should or shouldn’t do with

their bodies; not to have somebody else dictate, based on whatever their religion is or their rights, that they know better than somebody living in an issue that is so personal to them, that they can be dictated to in this day and age.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is important to point out that this legislation makes no distinction between those covered by it, whether they are children or adults, and that is my whole point, is that one of the problems with this is that it would block the effectiveness of State statutes that are there to protect children against interstate trafficking for the purpose of getting them abortions in another State without the knowledge or consent of their parents. That is an issue.

Yes—and I do maintain—I am not aware of a single State law that prohibits a woman from traveling out of State, an adult woman from traveling out of State. If such a law exists, I am not aware of it, and if it exists despite my nonawareness of it, it is unenforceable. It would be deemed invalid instantaneously. You can’t do that.

But what this would do, since it makes no distinction between children and adults, is it would halt the operation of these States’ State laws designed to protect children from interstate trafficking for the purpose of obtaining an abortion, which is very often necessary in order to conceal child sex perpetrators and child traffickers and what they are doing.

Now, my colleague and friend from Nevada, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, referred to this—kept characterizing the “far right.” Now, to my knowledge, nearly every Republican in this Chamber is pro-life. There are a few variations along the way, but nearly all of us are pro-life. To call all of us far right is excessive, and it is unfair. It is unfair especially because there is a mischaracterization also of why we believe what we believe. At least I can tell you what I believe about this.

She refers to States’ rights. I never call it that. Why? Well, because States don’t have rights; States have authority. Authority is sort of the inverse polar opposite of a right. A right is something that you have that protects you from actions by the State, by the government, protects you from the authority of the collective, coercive force that is government. So they aren’t States’ rights; this is State authority. And that is really how we arrived here. That is really where we have been for the last half-century.

While people are, on the left, bemoaning the deprivation of a right, I challenge each of them to tell me where in the Constitution it talks about abortion. Of course, the word “abortion” doesn’t appear in the Constitution, but what part of the Constitution actually confers that right? That is the problem we are getting at

here, and that is what I would like to address here for a moment.

You see, because in Washington, it sometimes starts to feel like we are up against an immovable object and where progress is measured in inches and then victories are sparse and hard-fought, and occasionally the tides turn and something significant happens and there is a seismic shift.

One year ago, we experienced such a seismic shift when the Supreme Court issued its landmark decision in the case of *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health*. But to fully appreciate the significance of that historic moment and that decision, we must first understand the journey that got us to this point in the first place. So let's rewind the clock 50 years, all the way back to 1973, when the Supreme Court handed down its ruling in *Roe v. Wade*, a decision that—to say that it legalized abortion doesn't really capture the image. It centralized power in Washington, DC, over abortion policy decisions, and then it kept that power not in the legislative branch of the Federal Government based in Washington, DC, but across the street at the Supreme Court in nine lawyers wearing black robes who have been sworn in as Justices, by removing the American people's ability to make decisions through their duly-elected lawmakers regarding abortion. It was a moment that completely reshaped the American people's ability to impact abortion policy.

So for nearly five decades after that decision, this power to determine abortion policy rested ultimately with the Supreme Court. Sure, the Supreme Court would leave enough wiggle room to leave the impression that lawmakers—primarily at the State level, of course—could make law, but the Supreme Court was constantly inventing and reinventing what the standard was, what was and what was not a permissible restriction on abortion.

You see, this is what happens when you make up a nonexistent constitutional right, when you just decide that something is really important, that you feel so strongly about it that it must be in there, that it has to be in the Constitution because it is so important. When you take away the constitutional text from the words of the document, all of a sudden, you are left in this sort of no-man's land where you have to make things up as you go along.

The result was chaos—49½ years of chaotic manipulation at will of the law. A State would do one thing; the Supreme Court would strike it down. Another State would do something slightly different; the Supreme Court would uphold it, sometimes changing the standards along the way.

But in *Dobbs*, the Supreme Court recognized the constitutional importance of keeping the power with the people, affirming that they have a legitimate interest in protecting the lives of the unborn and that they possess the authority to enact laws that reflect their values.

You see, remember a moment ago when we talked about the difference between authority and rights. They are the opposite of each other. Rights protect you from authority.

So when the Supreme Court decided as a matter of policy that it was so passionate about abortion in 1973 that it had to be in the Constitution, they effectively wrote it into the Constitution even though it is not there. They made it utterly impossible for people's elected representatives—either in their State legislative bodies, entities of local government, or, where appropriate, in Congress—to make most of the laws, and ultimately those were all subject to the will and the whim and the caprice of the Supreme Court. They did that because they deemed it part of the Constitution. But when you just deem something a part of the Constitution, that doesn't make it a part of the Constitution.

I believe it was Abraham Lincoln who once asked rhetorically the question: If you call the tail of a dog a leg, how many legs does the dog have?

He asked the question.

Someone answered: Five.

He said: No. Wrong. It is still four. Just because you call the tail a leg doesn't make it a leg. The dog still has four legs.

This is still the Constitution. There still is nothing in here that says, by the way, that people can't make laws to protect the lives of the unborn unless the Supreme Court decides that they are permissible based on its own meandering standards ultimately untethered from the text of the Constitution or from 400 years of Anglo-American legal and jurisprudential tradition.

So in *Dobbs*, they restored this power back to the people. In *Dobbs*, it reaffirmed the fundamental belief that every human life is sacred, and every human life is deserving of protection. In *Dobbs*, the Court recognized the decisions of deeply personal and morally significant matters should be made closest to the people they affect.

Unfortunately, in the wake of *Roe*, we have witnessed a really dark chapter in our Nation's history. This decision wrongly declared that abortion was a right, despite no mention of it anywhere in the Constitution. A decision ushered in a new era, one that forced us to tolerate some of the most barbaric of practices: late-term abortions, gruesome procedures that practically no American supports became a stain on our society.

Even as those cases were litigated, the gruesome procedures were described, some of the most hardened lawyers could barely tolerate mentioning or even listening to the words describing the procedures.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question about how long he plans to speak, just for the convenience of others?

Mr. LEE. Sure. I anticipate I will be finished within 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I appreciate that very much. Thank you.

Mr. LEE. We refuse to accept this as the new status quo. We knew something had gone terribly, terribly wrong.

The *Dobbs* decision brought us a glimmer of hope. It reaffirmed the fundamental belief that every human life really is sacred and is deserving of protection and is capable of being protected within our constitutional system.

Finally, we are empowered to exercise our constitutional prerogative and resume our efforts to protect the lives of the unborn and end these unspeakable horrors.

And so this issue of States' rights—again, these are not States' rights. That is oxymoronic. And we call it federalism, State authority. So this victory of *Dobbs*, it is not just a victory for States' sovereign authority; it is also a victory for humanity because when we are told by the judicial branch of government, contrary to fact that the Constitution tells us that we cannot, may not, must not protect unborn human life, that really does grave damage to humanity.

The victory in *Dobbs* is a reminder that we can't afford to turn a blind eye to the moral and ethical implications of our laws. We must proceed in a way that protects the innocent and defend against the atrocities allowed under this lofty-sounding but ultimately barbaric platitude of choice.

Even with this victory, we still have a long way to go. Contrary to the assertions of many on the Democratic side of the aisle, the *Dobbs* decision did not make abortion illegal. It did nothing of the sort.

While many States have passed laws that protect preborn children—and I applaud them for doing so—others have expanded their abortion laws. Late-term and partial-birth abortions are still a reality in many States. This isn't something that I celebrate. I disagree with those laws. But I don't live in those States. And the important thing is that the people in those States are making those laws. And most of the time, it is in the States, and not here in Congress, where things not rendered Federal by the Constitution should be decided.

As we approach the 1-year anniversary of *Dobbs*, I believe we are dutybound to remember the millions upon millions of innocent lives lost, the pain and suffering endured, and the resilience of the men and women who fought for those who could not fight for themselves, who have no voice and therefore had to have others speak on their behalf.

We should be inspired to build a society where every life is cherished, where compassion triumphs over convenience and cowardice, and where the horrors of abortion become a distant memory, especially the horrors of abortion forced upon us by a judicial oligarchy utterly untethered from the text of the Constitution.

The Dobbs decision represented a turning point the moment when we said: Enough is enough. Now we are positioned to acknowledge that every life, from conception to natural birth, deserves our protection and our compassion and our care. And, yes, in some States they are going to do that differently than in others, but the fact that they are going to do it differently in one State or another doesn't mean that they don't deserve protection.

So as we celebrate this milestone, I hope we can remain committed to this cause. Let us never forget the horrors hoisted upon us by Roe and the significance of the Dobbs decision in restoring sanity and compassion to the laws that guide our Nation. Together we can forge our future, where the rights of the unborn are safeguarded, where the dignity of every human being is cherished, and where the dark days of the past remain only as reminders of our resolve to create a better world.

In the face of adversity, remember that change is possible. Remember that we possess the ability to achieve great things. Our Nation's health and strength lie in the people's hands, and together we can shape a future where every life is valued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to support my colleague and friend Senator CORTEZ MASTO in her efforts to bring this legislation not only to the floor but to passage.

This has been a long, long trail of broken promises and false assertions. It began with the broken promises and false assertions of judicial nominees who came before the Judiciary Committee to assure us that the protections of Roe v. Wade were a precedent and that they would respect precedent. Of course, that all evaporated.

We then heard the argument that this was "States' rights." My friend from Utah may not like the phrase, but it is one that his side has used over and over and over again. Call it States' rights or call it federalism, the notion was that all we were doing was opening this up to States.

But you heard right here on the Senate floor that the notion that every pregnancy is subject to the control of the government from the moment of conception. That does not allow for a differentiation between one State and another.

And now that the States' rights assertion has been proven false, now that it is clear that there are many Members not only of Congress but of State legislatures who want a nationwide ban on women's ability to make these reproductive choices, it becomes clearer and clearer why this particular bill is so important. It is only a matter of time until we see those bills being voted on in legislatures, trying to criminalize a citizen of one State if they go to another State to get this kind of care or trying to create a nationwide abortion ban.

However you call it, it will intrude on the ability of women to go and seek this care. And what we are seeing already is women with troubled pregnancies, for whom there is an indicated treatment, unable to get the treatment that medical science knows is the right treatment, whether it is twins, one of whom isn't viable, or a woman's ability to have further pregnancies if this one is not terminated, or the ability of a woman to simply be treated for sepsis, for instance, before it turns to life-threatening and not have to wait and look at the watch and let her get sicker and sicker, knowing that the end is the same, in any event, but putting her life and health at risk in order to allow the will of a bunch of State legislators to turn up in the examination room or the treatment room with her and her family and her doctor. For all of these reasons—because the proponents of a nationwide abortion ban, because the proponents of undoing Roe v. Wade, have simply been incredible for too long—we simply have to assume the worst.

And this bill is an important and sensible way to make sure that if the Presiding Officer's State or my State want to allow that freedom for women, that women can come there and get the care that they need—very often, in a troubled pregnancy, for their own or their future children's or the siblings' well-being. So for all those reasons, I wish we had the chance to vote on this and look forward to future chances.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 631

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, as we know, this Saturday marks the 1-year anniversary of the day the U.S. Supreme Court decided to overturn half a century of precedent on a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions.

I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Rhode Island and all of my colleagues who are here today.

When they made this decision, it went against the 70 to 80 percent of Americans who believe that this decision should be made by a woman and her family and her doctor and not by politicians. As a result, as we predicted that day, women across the country are at the mercy of a patchwork of State laws governing their ability to access reproductive care.

In States like Texas, women have been forced to carry pregnancies for days after learning that their baby would not survive because their doctors can't legally provide care unless their life is at risk.

And then there was the heartbreaking story about the 10-year-old girl in Ohio who had to go to Indiana to get an abortion after she was raped—10 years old. People said it was some kind of a hoax. It wasn't. It was real. And everyone in this Chamber knows it.

The Supreme Court's decision threatened women's health and freedom. And to this day, it demands a legislative response, not a response where the women of Texas are told that they have different rights. In fact, no rights compared to women in Minnesota or even in our next-door State of Wisconsin. Part of that is codifying Roe v. Wade into law. That is true.

We must also address the full scope that women are facing, the full scope of threats right now. Recent reports have illustrated how social media companies are collecting and data brokers are selling location data that could be used to identify women seeking reproductive healthcare services.

We know that the collection of this data, we know that people on both sides of the aisle understand that this has ramifications beyond women seeking abortion care. They could have anyone, man or woman, seeking a mental health provider, an addiction clinic, counseling therapy—all of it—the rules are murky, and the data is being collected and sold.

That is why I am leading the UP-HOLD Privacy Act with a number of our colleagues, including Senator WARREN and Senator HIRONO. And that is why I am seeking unanimous consent to pass this legislation.

Our bill sets commonsense limits on how companies can use people's personal data. First, it bans data brokers from selling location data. Women making their most personal healthcare decisions should be able to go to their doctors' appointments and consult specialists without worrying that the data about their location where they are going to be or are will be purchased or sold.

Second, it says you can't use health data for commercial advertising purposes, period. That means companies can't use data from fitness trackers or browser histories to sell ads, all healthcare data.

Third, it gives consumers more say over how their personal healthcare information is used by allowing them to request that their data be deleted.

It also places limits on what health data companies can collect about Americans. Consumers deserve to be in the driver's seat when it comes to determining how their personal health data is used. This legislation does just that.

It is past time that we update our privacy laws, in general, and I hope we get that done by the end of this year. But we must also update our health privacy laws to reflect the reality of how social media platforms and data brokers are profiting off our data.

In a world without Roe, this couldn't be more urgent. I supported, with a Republican, limits on this health data to begin with, and now, as we are in this post-Roe world, as I know, it becomes even more important.

I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in declaring that these Big Tech companies cannot sell

off, through data brokers, our private personal healthcare and that our decisions should never be a tool for profit. This is not a radical proposal. It is completely common sense.

As we get closer to marking a year without *Roe v. Wade*, I continue to stand with my colleagues in the fight for reproductive freedom. We stand firmly on the side of the American people who have come together, time and time again, in Kentucky, in Michigan, in Montana, and in the middle of the prairie in Kansas to defend reproductive rights. We will not settle for a reality in which our daughters have fewer rights than their mothers and their grandmothers.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 631 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Madam President, this bill presents a solution in search of a problem. Unfortunately, it appears that the intent of this legislation is to treat abortion as healthcare, to prevent pro-life entities from sponsoring ads designed to help provide women and girls with trustworthy support during pregnancy, and to make it harder for States to enforce their own laws protecting life and the most vulnerable.

When it comes to ensuring patient privacy and healthcare, I believe there are bipartisan solutions to be found that we can all agree on. One-sided efforts to promote abortion are not the way for us to find common ground on this issue.

I would also like to point out that this bill has not received a hearing or markup in the Commerce Committee, which would be a great opportunity to have.

I would like to turn now to recognize that this Saturday will mark the first anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*. I am incredibly proud that this victory for the pro-life movement, reversing the moral stain of *Roe v. Wade*, came out of my State of Mississippi. I am amazed and grateful that in God's sovereign plan, a law introduced by my friend, Mississippi State Representative Becky Currie, ultimately achieved what I and so many have prayed for, for 50 years now, to restore the sanctity of life.

My friend, Mississippi Attorney General Lynn Fitch, our State's solicitor general, Scott Stewart, and the many others in the AG's office worked tirelessly to represent our State's direct challenge to *Roe*.

After a draft of the *Dobbs* majority opinion was shamefully leaked, the

conservative Justices resisted disgraceful intimidation tactics and threats to their own lives. They stayed true to their judicial oaths to uphold and defend the Constitution.

The Supreme Court recognized correctly in *Dobbs* that the Constitution does not confer a right to abortion and that *Roe* was "egregiously wrong and on a collision course with the Constitution from the day it was decided."

While the *Dobbs* decision did not end abortion in America, it took a monumental step in returning the issue back into the hands of the people and their elected representatives. Today, as a result, 14 States are protecting unborn children through all 9 months of pregnancy. Several others now protect babies at the point where they have a heartbeat, at 6 weeks, and still others at 12 weeks. One recent study found that there were more than 24,000 unborn children saved from abortion in the first 9 months since *Dobbs*. That is 24,000 miracles, because that is what a child is—a miracle.

But it is not just the States that can protect life after *Dobbs*. We in Congress also have a responsibility to protect life and stop the Democrats' extreme pro-abortion agenda.

It saddens me deeply that Democrats in Congress continue to advocate for appalling legislation that would impose legalized abortion on demand up until the moment of birth across all 50 States. Their legislation is even more radical than *Roe* was and would eliminate even the most modest pro-life protections, like parental involvement laws and bans on sex-selective abortions. Democrats cannot name a single limit on abortion they support—not one.

The American people, however, reject this extreme position. A new Tarrance Group poll this month found that three-fourths of voters oppose allowing abortions through all 9 months of pregnancy and support at least some limits to abortion.

More Americans continue to reject abortion when they learn more about the child in the womb—when they can hear the child's heartbeat, when they can see them suck their thumbs and yawn in an ultrasound, and when they learn that they can feel pain.

Despite this, the Biden administration's FDA and Department of Justice continue to allow the abortion industry to obstruct the will of pro-life States by illegally flooding the mail with do-it-yourself abortion pills, turning post offices into abortion centers. These actions not only endanger women's lives and their health, but they violate longstanding Federal laws that clearly prohibit the mailing of abortifacient drugs.

Finally, we also must advance policies to support pregnant mothers in choosing life. In particular, we need to support the work of pregnancy centers. More than 2,700 pregnancy centers across the country provide critical medical and material support for

women and families facing unplanned pregnancies to choose life rather than abortion.

This is the promise of the Declaration of Independence: that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life.

Thanks to the Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs*, 1 year ago this week, we can finally begin the hard work to make good on the promise for unborn Americans too.

Finally, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Just a few specific responses. First of all, this bill is very specific. It addresses health and location data, and, as I noted before, I continue to believe that we need Federal privacy legislation, in general, to address other privacy needs. But this bill is targeted at sensitive health data when it comes to location.

And I know it was the conservative members of the Supreme Court who actually issued the broad decision to overturn half a century of precedent on a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. And this bill is a targeted response on one issue, and that is to set commonsense limits on how companies can use people's personal data.

I just also wanted to respond to the issue of mifepristone, which was temporarily thrown out by one judge in the State of Texas, and that is now pending before several different courts. A different decision was made in another court, in Washington State. But I will note that the statute referred to, which would somehow limit this drug that was approved by the FDA decades ago and has been found safe in dozens and dozens of countries across the globe—that law that was referred to was actually enacted, the Comstock Act in 1873—when they treated pneumonia with bloodletting, when the Pony Express existed, and, which I know, is 10 years before they even did the "Yellowstone" prequel.

So if my colleagues want to move backward to that time period, those are the laws they are citing. I believe the people of this country want to move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1297

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, listening to this debate today, I can't believe we are having these debates in 2023. It is just stunning to me that we are having to debate privacy and the ability to make your own reproductive health decisions and all the ramifications for it. But here we are.

So I rise today to speak up for American women, the doctors who care for us, and our freedom to make our own healthcare decisions. What a novel idea that, in the United States of America, we would be able to make our own healthcare decisions.

But thanks to a radically conservative Supreme Court and radicals in State legislatures, reproductive freedom is no longer a constitutional right in the United States.

Roe v. Wade protected our freedoms for 50 years, until it didn't. Nearly half of the 50 States have already banned abortion or are likely to do that—half. And, sadly, this change is already making American healthcare worse. It just breaks my heart to hear about the individual situations of women.

In Michigan, fortunately, we are in a situation where the people of Michigan have stood up for reproductive freedom. But to see the women coming into Michigan, the people who are pregnant coming into Michigan, who are coming in to get help that they can't get in their own State, it just breaks my heart.

A poll of OB/GYNs released today by the independent health policy research organization KFF shows the effects. Sixty-four percent of OB/GYNs surveyed said that the Dobbs decision has increased pregnancy-related deaths. Now think about that: 64 percent of the doctors—of the OB/GYNs surveyed—said that this Supreme Court decision has increased pregnancy-related deaths.

Seventy percent of OB/GYNs said that the Dobbs decision has made racial and ethnic inequalities in healthcare worse. And 68 percent of OB/GYNs—the doctors serving women—say that the Dobbs decision has made it harder for them to manage their patients' pregnancy-related emergencies, including women who desperately want their babies. They are desperate for this. They want to have this child. And something comes up, and it breaks their heart and their family's hearts. And there is an emergency that may threaten their life, and doctors are saying that it is harder for them to respond in an emergency.

Just think about that: 68 percent of doctors say that this Supreme Court decision makes it harder for them to keep patients alive.

These doctors know what they need to do to save lives. In many States, they are just not allowed to do it. How could that be in America in 2023?

And even doctors in States like Michigan—and I am proud to say we now protect reproductive freedom in our constitution, voted on by the people of our State, overwhelmingly, last November. But even we aren't immune from that.

A State law in Texas allows vigilantes to sue doctors even in States where abortion is legal. So much for States' rights. And radicals in other States are scrambling to pass similar legislation.

That is why we need the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Healthcare Act. Thank you to Senators MURRAY and PADILLA and LUJÁN and ROSEN for leading this effort, and I am proud to be their partner, as we all are.

This bill would ensure that healthcare providers in States where

abortion is legal—States' rights; it is legal—can keep providing the reproductive healthcare their patients need. And it would help protect patients across the country who choose to access reproductive healthcare in a State where it is legal.

I trust Michigan doctors. Michigan doctors know what their patients need. What Michigan doctors and their patients don't need are Texas legislators standing in their exam rooms.

It is time to pass this legislation to protect doctors and to protect their patients. So, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1297 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I object to S. 1297 for a simple reason: It would make it easier for unborn life to be ended.

Last year's Dobbs decision brought renewed hope to Americans who believe in the sanctity of each and every life, including life in the womb. After 49 years, a new culture of life has begun to take hold across our country. But this bill would actually take us backwards.

This bill would allow abortion on demand in pro-life States so long as the patient is from another State. This bill would expose doctors and nurses who work in religious organizations, clinics, and hospitals—it would expose them to costly lawsuits if they stand by their deeply held beliefs. This bill would violate the spirit of bipartisan Hyde protections by providing 80 million taxpayer dollars to the abortion industry.

I was elected to save as many unborn lives as possible, and this bill puts more unborn lives in danger; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, let me say two points to my colleague. First, fundamentally, this is about who makes medical decisions. Do we trust women? Do we trust the person who is pregnant? Do we trust their ability to work with their doctor? Who makes the decision in the United States of America? We stand with the women of America.

The second thing I will say is that it is so difficult for me to hear over and over again about the sanctity of life when I lead the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, where we have to fight every day to make sure food is available for children who are born.

The House of Representatives just passed an agriculture appropriations bill that gutted WIC, which is the

Women, Infants, and Children Program for newborn babies and moms, to get them started in a healthy life.

When we can't pass quality standards for Medicaid births, which are half the births of this country, because we have had objections on the other side of the aisle for years about somehow having quality standards for prenatal care and birth, it is very hard for me to listen to the idea that we ought to be protecting—it is not just the unborn. It is the born. It is the children. It is the moms. It is the quality of life that we fight for every day, for food, healthcare, and so on.

So I find it very hard to listen to that language.

I am very disappointed that there is an objection to a bill that would let doctors practice healthcare to protect women and babies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before she leaves the floor, let me say to my seatmate on the Senate Finance Committee how much I appreciate her passion and leadership on this critical issue.

I note that the Presiding Officer is also one of the outspoken members on the committee on this issue.

This has been a terrific debate coming from our side, and I thank my colleague for her comments.

It has been a year since the atrocious decision of Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization. I remember reading the leaked decision in the press early last May and realizing with dread that the Court was going to strike down Roe v. Wade. My first reaction was that the Court has set in motion a catastrophe for the health, safety, and privacy of American women. To the horror of the 36 million women living in States that have already banned abortion or are likely to ban access to abortion, unfortunately, my prediction was right.

The Supreme Court's decision in Dobbs tossed out half a century of legal precedent, curtailed the fundamental rights of women, and jeopardized the health and safety of millions across the country. The Court defied the American people, who are living with the grim reality that some of the Nation's most powerful people are eager to violate their privacy and their basic right to make their own decisions with respect to healthcare.

So the last year has been a nightmare for millions of women in America. It has been especially felt by those living in the more than 20 States that have passed laws banning or severely restricting access to abortion.

The personal stories that you hear if you spend time listening are gut-wrenching. Women in Texas who desperately wanted to be parents and suffered pregnancy complications nearly died trying to access lifesaving care. Yet they were told they weren't sick enough to get it. Far-right politicians

are suing healthcare providers for providing care to a 10-year-old who had been raped—raped—and was pregnant. The cruelty apparently is the point.

I am proud to be from Oregon, where abortion remains legal. We have some of the most pro-choice laws in the country for those seeking reproductive health care. That is because, in Oregon, we understand that people can make the best decisions for themselves and their families. But even in Oregon, you can't take freedom for granted. Extreme Republicans won't stop until they pass a national ban on abortion, and they are trying.

A national 6-week ban was introduced in Congress right after the Dobbs decision came out. Anti-abortion advocates sought out a lone judge in Amarillo, TX, to ban mifepristone, which is widely and safely used in medication abortions nationwide. The FDA approved the safe and effective medication for dispensation more than 20 years ago. I organized the first congressional hearings about this drug as a Member of the other body in 1990. This effort was never based on some extreme or some political agenda; it was based on one proposition—that science ought to be making the judgments and not politics.

I came to the Senate floor in February and called on the administration to do everything it could to keep the lifesaving medication on the market. Thankfully the far-right extremists haven't won yet, but, as a number of my colleagues have said today correctly, we are not home-free as that case moves through the courts.

Contrary to what Justice Kavanaugh told us in concurrence of Dobbs, anti-abortion zealots are not leaving these matters up to the States. Several States are trying to restrict freedom of movement, criminalizing women who travel to other States for an abortion or even the person who gives them a ride. Think about that. You can't sugarcoat that. They are talking about enacting laws that reach beyond State borders, and that harkens back to some very dark days in our history.

This has always been about control, and one speaker after another on our side has said that through the course of the day. This is about politicians inserting themselves in exam rooms and in the private decisions about whether and when to start a family.

I care about this issue for several reasons. Right at the heart of my concern is Americans' right to privacy. That right to privacy is what makes America, America.

As women grapple with the strictest State laws that threaten their health and take away their privacy, they also face a crisis of digital privacy and what we have come to call uterus surveillance. Governments are weaponizing the most personal and private data about women's bodies and healthcare and using it against them. I and a number of colleagues on our side have been sounding this alarm for years that lo-

cation data leached from phone apps is ripe for abuse. States where extremists have restricted or banned abortion—that goes straight to a five-alarm crisis.

We also know that shady data brokers have tracked women to and from Planned Parenthood centers. They have and will sell this information to anybody with a credit card. And in States where abortion is illegal, anything women say or read online can be used against them. Researching birth control online, updating a period tracking app, even just carrying a phone into the doctor's office—you name it—it is potential evidence for the prosecution. The possibilities are endless and frightening.

As to our laws governing women's sensitive private health data, as we think about what is ahead, we have to recognize that those laws have been outdated and weak for decades. I commend the administration for drawing attention to this issue and being interested in shoring up loopholes in our laws.

More has to be done. We have seen over this past year that Republican State attorneys general and Governors are ready and willing to discard women's privacy in their quest to prohibit access to reproductive health care.

This has been a horrific year, but as my colleagues have said on the floor this afternoon, we are going to be resolute. All the bills that the group led by Senator MURRAY, my colleague, the President of the Senate—they are common sense. They are common sense, the package that my colleagues have offered today for unanimous consent. They go a long way toward protecting women and healthcare providers.

I just want my constituents to know and I want my colleagues here in the Senate to know I am on the program. I don't think this is the time when we can even take for granted any of these concerns—not a one. The whole question of access to healthcare, the right to privacy, making sure that States' rights really mean States' rights and not tracking people down across the country—these are all priorities that my colleagues have laid out very, very well.

As long as I have the honor to represent Oregon in the U.S. Senate, I am going to be working with all of them.

The fact is, as we close—and it seems like we are getting ready to wrap up—I think it is clear that the American people are on the side of my colleagues over here who have spoken today.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, earlier this afternoon, my colleague Senator MARKEY asked unanimous consent to advance the Right to Contraception Act. There was an objection heard, but I wanted to come to the floor to voice my strong support as a cosponsor of the Right to Contraception Act.

Across the country, women are frightened. They are frightened that after decades of progress in advancing their rights and freedoms, they are watching an activist Supreme Court ignore precedent and strip away their rights and freedoms.

For nearly six decades, American women have come to rely on their right to control when and if they are going to have a family, including through the use of contraception. In fact, about 90 percent of women in the United States have used contraception.

In 1965, the Supreme Court correctly decided *Griswold v. Connecticut*, reaffirming that our Constitution guarantees the right to privacy. This particular case was over a Connecticut law that banned the use of contraception and imposed penalties, including up to 1 year in prison for doing so. The Supreme Court correctly overruled the law as an invasion of the right to privacy and determined that Americans could use contraception should they choose without government interference.

At the time, the majority opinion reasoned that there were many implied rights that Americans have within the Constitution. On a basic level, this is obvious. Not every single right we are due could be written into our Constitution. So this concept of "implied rights" is the foundation for various rights that Americans have come to rely on and, frankly, never think twice about, like the right to learn a foreign language or to travel across State lines or to live with your own family.

Famously, 8 years after *Griswold* was decided, the Supreme Court used a similar legal foundation—the constitutional right to privacy—to rightly decide in *Roe v. Wade* that women in the United States have the right to abortion care.

But, despite *Roe* being the law of the land for nearly 50 years and "settled as a precedent of the Supreme Court, entitled to respect under principles of stare decisis," according to Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh, it was thrown out the window.

This Saturday will mark the 1-year anniversary since this activist Supreme Court—crafted, of course, by anti-choice Republican politicians—stripped 22 million women and counting of their freedom to control their bodies, families, and futures; 1 year since women lost the right to an abortion nationwide; 1 year since women in my home State of Wisconsin were sent back to 1849—and I didn't misstate that, 1849—living under an archaic law that effectively criminalizes all abortion procedures; 1 year since women in America became second-class citizens.

Sadly, that fateful decision that overturned *Roe v. Wade* put more of Americans' rights on the chopping block.

In Justice Clarence Thomas's concurring opinion, he explicitly said that the rationale used to overturn *Roe* should be used to overturn cases establishing

the right to contraception, the right to same-sex consensual relations, and same-sex marriage. Justice Thomas wrote that the Court “should reconsider” all three of these decisions, saying the Supreme Court had a duty to correct the error in these decisions.

He was essentially providing an open invitation to litigators across the country to bring their cases to the Court, inevitably instilling fear among millions of Americans.

Let that sink in.

With the right to abortion care already ripped away from tens of millions of Americans, a Supreme Court Justice essentially asked for someone to bring him a case so he could rip away one of the only tools many women have left to control if and when to have a family—that being having access to contraception.

Americans have spoken loudly and clearly that they do not believe that a woman's right to control her own body is an error or that the freedom for someone to love whom they love is an error. We cannot rely on an activist Supreme Court to protect our rights and freedoms. Congress must act.

So I stand here, with the backing of 9 in 10 Americans who support access to all forms of birth control, to call for the Senate to listen to our constituents and pass the Right to Contraception Act. Our legislation is simple and common sense. It would guarantee the legal right for individuals to get and use contraception, and it would stop politicians or the government from trying to get in the way, and that is it.

Americans want the right and freedom to control their own reproductive healthcare without interference from judges or politicians. In my home State of Wisconsin, where women are already living under an 1849 criminal abortion ban, access to contraception is absolutely essential. Every person should have the right to control their own bodies, families, and futures no matter where they live. Former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, who advocated for the right to privacy, called it “the right to be left alone.”

So I stand here to reiterate this sentiment and to tell Washington to pass our legislation and give women the right to be left alone.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

ABORTION

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, 1 year ago, Americans lost a constitutional right for the first time in history, and they didn't just lose it—Republicans ripped it away.

Just 1 year now after the Dobbs decision, more than 22 million women have lost their right to an abortion, and no corner of our country has been spared from the fallout. Abortion providers in States where abortion is legal, like in my home State of Washington, are being overworked and just totally overwhelmed with patients who have had to wait weeks and travel hundreds of miles to get an abortion.

Then there is the wave of other appalling Republican attacks on abortion: proposals to charge grandmas and older sisters with human trafficking if they drive a minor out of State for an abortion, prosecute abortion providers—doctors—as criminals, ban emergency contraceptives like Plan B, and let's not forget the partisan lawsuit on mifepristone to rip safe medication abortion off the shelves in all 50 States.

You know, when you listen to patients about what this all means and when you hear the actual stories—the nightmares—that Republicans are putting women in this country through, they are heartbreaking: parents driving miles and miles because their child was raped, their child is pregnant, and abortion is banned in their State; doctors being forced to forgo providing lifesaving care because they fear Republican politicians will put them in jail for doing their jobs; women facing miscarriages, left bleeding, unable to get the care they need for days on end.

One woman learned that her fetus had no skull—had no chance of survival—and she still could not get abortion care in her State.

Another woman learned that she had an ectopic pregnancy—a serious, life-threatening condition. She was not able to get an abortion. Instead, when she was at death's door, she ended up having to get a hysterectomy. Why? Because Republican politicians decided that their views mattered more than her health and mattered more than her family.

Let's be clear. The vast, overwhelming majority of Americans stand with women and support the right to choose abortion. In every place abortion rights were on the ballot last November—every single place—abortion rights won. Still, the Republicans are ignoring their own constituents and doubling down on their extreme anti-abortion politics.

Just now, when we tried to pass other basic protections—and I mean the most simple, most straightforward protections imaginable, protections that just say, yes, you can travel to another State for an abortion; that, yes, doctors can provide an abortion in States where it is legal without fear of being thrown into prison; that, yes, we will protect the right to birth control; that, yes, we will keep your online health and location data private so it cannot be used against you—the Republicans said: No, we are not going to let you do that.

One Senator on the floor earlier said that legislation that restricts a woman's right to travel is really about protecting minors from trafficking. Seriously? That is outrageous, and I was absolutely—and I mean absolutely—outraged to hear him say that. I hope that the American people understand what those laws mean.

What it means is that a grandmother who is taking her 17-year-old granddaughter—who was raped or who,

maybe, just wants to make her own personal healthcare decision—to a State where abortion is legal could be jailed. States like Idaho have passed these laws that restrict travel. What they do is hold the young women captive in their own State and threaten anyone who might help them get the care they need with time in prison. Those kinds of laws and proposals in other States are an appalling attack on the rights of women and our most basic right as Americans to travel freely within our own country.

I absolutely refuse to let a Senator or anyone twist the reality of these truly heinous laws being passed to hold women captive and to force them to stay pregnant no matter what.

Now, Republicans have basically adopted two approaches to the healthcare crisis they have caused: one, to double down with increasingly extreme, dangerous proposals or, two, to stick their heads in the sand whether that means pretending this isn't a problem, pretending it is not really their fault, or hoping it will fade away.

But there is just no forgetting the unforgivable pain the Republicans' policies have caused.

There is no forgetting the fear of being pregnant when you don't want to be or the heartbreak of learning a pregnancy is not viable or the horror of learning it is life-threatening and knowing you have no control over your body.

There is no forgetting the panic of calculating how many thousands of miles you will have to travel to get care or how many days you will have to take off of work and wonder how you can possibly get the care you need and whether you will face legal action for doing so.

There is no forgetting being investigated for having a miscarriage or for driving your kid across State lines to get an abortion or hearing your doctor tell you they cannot act to save your life because they are afraid of going to jail.

People across this country are facing those realities every single day.

Women are heartbroken and terrified, but they are also mad. They are determined, and they are speaking out. They are not going to settle for a country where they don't have the fundamental freedom to decide what happens to their own bodies—where their daughters and granddaughters have fewer rights than they did just a few years ago—and neither am I.

We on the Democratic side are going to stand up and tell our stories. We are going to make our voices heard, and we are going to fight here, on this side, to restore the freedoms that Republicans took away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me first salute my colleague from the State of Washington. She has really shown extraordinary leadership on this

and so many other issues. She asked us to gather today, on the first anniversary of the Dobbs decision, to really reflect on what has happened to America in 12 months.

I am saying that 2 months ago the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, held a hearing on the devastating consequences of the Dobbs decision on the women and doctors who are affected by it. We did it 2 months ago because the news was pouring in of incidents which had to be told and shared with the American people. Growing reports of chaos and harm caused by that decision are so alarming that we decided to move up our fact-finding to 2 months ago.

There was one witness I will never forget. One of the people we heard from that day was Amanda Zurawski. She shared some of the most heartbreaking testimony I have ever heard, and I have heard a lot.

Last August, in the second trimester of her pregnancy, Amanda suffered a catastrophic medical condition which ensured that she would lose her much loved and much longed-for baby. What is more, without medical care to help manage her miscarriage, Amanda was in grave risk of dying herself. But she was denied that medical care for one reason—she lived in the wrong place—because Amanda Zurawski lived in Texas, which was one of the first States to impose a near-total ban of abortions after *Roe v. Wade* was overruled. So Amanda waited at home, in agony, for days. Then sepsis set in. Her husband rushed her to the hospital. Hours later, her daughter arrived still-born. Amanda spent the next 3 days in the ICU, fighting for her own life.

Amanda told our committee:

People have asked why we didn't get on a plane or in our car to go to a state where the laws aren't so restrictive. But we live in the middle of Texas, and the nearest "sanctuary" state is at least an eight-hour drive. Developing sepsis—which can kill [very] quickly—in a car in the middle of the West Texas desert, or 30,000 feet above the ground, is a death sentence. . . . So all we could do was wait.

This was Amanda's first baby. Tragically, because of the trauma her body endured, she may never have another.

And she is not alone. This is happening to women across America. Every day brings us another heartbreaking story of a woman who is denied healthcare, another story of a woman whose life was needlessly put at risk by the Dobbs decision.

According to a new survey, nearly two-thirds of OB/GYNs say the Dobbs ruling has worsened maternal mortality rates in the United States, which were already the worst of any developed nation, and 70 percent of these doctors say the ruling has deepened racial disparities in maternal and infant healthcare. These findings are from a survey released this week by KFF, known as Kaiser Family Foundation.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the AMA both warned that the Dobbs case would

unleash an immediate healthcare crisis in our country. With the first anniversary of this ruling, those warnings, sadly, have come true.

Just 100 days after the Dobbs decision, 22 million Americans of reproductive age—almost one out of every three women in America—found themselves living in States where abortion is now illegal or highly restricted. Abortion is now completely banned in 14 States, leaving large swaths of the country without care. Some statewide bans include jail time for healthcare providers who perform abortions. And make no mistake: Unless we act, more and more severe restrictions are coming.

The last year has exposed the true aim of the anti-choice extremists. They want a national ban. Medication abortions account for more than half of all abortions in America. More than 20 years ago, the Food and Drug Administration approved the drug mifepristone as safe and effective for use in medication abortions. Yet anti-abortion groups are now seeking in Federal court to ban its use in every State in America.

The impact of abortion restrictions in any State are felt well beyond that State's borders. In my State, largely as a consequence of near-total bans in many surrounding States, the number of abortions performed by Planned Parenthood in Illinois increased by 54 percent last year. That increase was driven largely by women from out of State seeking access to abortion that is now outlawed in their home States. As a result, wait times to obtain abortions have increased dramatically in our State.

In addition, some anti-choice extremists are seeking to deny women's right to abortions through increased threats and violence against abortion clinics.

We saw this recently in Illinois, when a man rammed his car into a building that was being renovated to serve as an abortion clinic in the Danville area. He also tried to set fire to the clinic; but, thankfully, he was stopped.

According to the National Abortion Federation, last year saw a huge increase in violence at abortion clinics, and a disproportionate increase occurred in States like Illinois that protected women's rights to reproductive care.

Personal decisions about healthcare should be made by individuals and their doctors, not by politicians with an ideological agenda. That is why I strongly support the four measures that my Democratic colleagues have offered to today to protect women's rights to travel to receive healthcare, protect patients' data privacy, protect healthcare providers' ability to provide abortions in States where it is legal, and protect the right to contraception. It is hard to imagine that in 2023, we are actually facing the prospect of losing a woman's right to contraception, as well as access to reproductive healthcare.

The Dobbs ruling has sown chaos, fear, and division. It has usurped doc-

tors' rights to make the best healthcare decisions for their patients. Doctors live in fear of these new laws, whether they include criminal liability for what was good medical practice and still is. They have stripped women of their right to make healthcare decisions and given the power to politicians. It is now up to Congress to protect women and healthcare providers from the results of this disastrous ruling.

(Mr. OSSOFF assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, you were at the Judiciary Committee today. We had a hearing on LGBTQ rights, and there was some extraordinary testimony. A 16-year-old came to us who has gone through a change to her status. This young woman, 16 years of age, explained how she realized at the age of 10 or 11 that she was really inclined toward being a woman and not a man. She sought counseling, through her understanding parents, sat down with doctors, and they began working through the psychology of that decision, the importance of it.

Fortunately for her—and she testified—her parents were supportive of her all the way. We were lucky to have Dr. Ximena Lopez at the hearing as well. She practices medicine in Texas. She is an endocrinologist who treats patients just like this young 16-year-old girl.

She disabused us of many of the myths which are outstanding when it comes to healthcare for those who are in a trans situation. No, there are no surgeries early in life on these children who are making this decision. Yes, medications are held back until puberty to make sure that they are doing the right thing at the right time. Yes, parents are consulted every step of the way.

These are important and critical decisions which parents and families make every day across America. Every day. They are decisions based on the advice of a doctor, as well as what is right for your child. They are decisions that parents will never forget. I know; I have been involved in them. And they are decisions which really would determine the future lives and the well-being of so many individuals.

To think that so many legislatures across the United States are now regulating and putting criminal penalties on the conduct of that doctor who was before us today is heartbreaking. It defies medicine. It defies science. It is politics, pure and simple. The same thing is true on this issue of women's reproductive healthcare.

We have got to leave these basic decisions, fundamental decisions, to the families who are affected by them directly, to the women who are affected by them directly. We have got to say to the doctors across America: Follow the science. Practice good medicine. Don't let a local legislature divert you from the best treatment of your patient to make sure that they come out of this process in a very positive way.

It is a sad moment in America that we are debating these things and debating whether or not to rely on sound medical judgment. In the end, that is the only thing we can count on.

I am glad that we had the hearing today, and I am glad that we gathered on the floor to make a record out of what is happening in our great Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Space Force; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN503 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning ANDREW K. BERKEY, and ending BRANDON WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN504 AIR FORCE nomination of Jacquelyn P. Smith, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN596 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning DAVID B. BARKER, and ending JOCELYN M. WHALEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN653 AIR FORCE nomination of Daniel J. Wittmer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN654 AIR FORCE nomination of Marina F. Perez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN692 AIR FORCE nominations (265) beginning STEPHEN DAVID ALBERT, and ending JAMIE TAYLOR ZIMMERMANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN693 AIR FORCE nominations (135) beginning ROBERT D. ALLEN, and ending NICOLAS H. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN694 AIR FORCE nominations (600) beginning CHRISTOPHER K. ADAMS, and ending RAYMOND P. ZHANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN695 AIR FORCE nominations (74) beginning NICHOLAS F. ALIOTTA, and ending JASON J. ZUMMO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN697 AIR FORCE nominations (52) beginning ANDREW D. AHN, and ending

OYUNCHIMEG YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN698 AIR FORCE nominations (14) beginning SARAH E. ABEL, and ending MICHELLE E. WYCHE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN699 AIR FORCE nominations (20) beginning MICHAEL J. ALFARO, and ending SARA M. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN700 AIR FORCE nomination of Candice L. Pipes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN701 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL A. GROWDEN, and ending HSIENLIANG R. TSENG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN745 AIR FORCE nomination of Craig A. Ambrose, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN746 AIR FORCE nomination of Bibek Joshi, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN747 AIR FORCE nomination of Adrian K. Williford, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN748 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning DANIEL D. COLE, and ending EDWARD F. LEONARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

IN THE ARMY

PN472 ARMY nominations (90) beginning KYLE D. AEMISEGGER, an ending DOI7212, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2023.

PN473 ARMY nominations (19) beginning AILEEN R. CABANADALOGAN, and ending JOHN F. UNDERWOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2023.

PN515 ARMY nominations (136) beginning HARRY T. AUBIN, and ending D016621, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN516 ARMY nominations (29) beginning JOSHUA A. AKERS, and ending SHENICE L. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN517 ARMY nomination (301) beginning ALEXANDRA M. ADAMS, and ending D016620, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN518 ARMY nominations (61) beginning ANDREA C. BAEDER, and ending PETERS. YOON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN602 ARMY nominations (76) beginning HEATHER R. ALSUPMORTON, and ending JUDITH L. ZELAYA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN603 ARMY nominations (122) beginning BOMA O. AFIESIMAMA, and ending D016999, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN604 ARMY nominations (31) beginning JAMIE D. BELL, and ending JUSTIN ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN605 ARMY nominations (13) beginning RACHEL A. ACCIACCA, and ending LAURA

E. RIDDLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN606 ARMY nominations (33) beginning JAMILIA M. ADAMSHENDERSON, and ending JOHN E. WILSON, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN607 ARMY nominations (44) beginning COREBRIANS A. ABRAHAM, and ending CHRISTOPHER R. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN608 ARMY nominations (10) beginning AARON CROMBIE, and ending LARRY A. WYATT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN609 ARMY nominations (7) beginning CHARLES E. BANE, and ending THOMAS R. TUCKER, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN643 ARMY nomination of Thomas A. Summers, which was received by the Congressional Record of May 9, 2023.

PN655 ARMY nomination of Nicholas J. Norton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN656 ARMY nomination of Artrees R. Adams, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN657 ARMY nomination of Warren N. Washington, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN658 ARMY nomination of Jacob W. Cavender, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN659 ARMY nomination of Justin M. Fowler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN660 ARMY nomination of Jason P. Pancoe, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN661 ARMY nomination of Benjamin F. Iverson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN702 ARMY nomination of Mark G. Kappelmann, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN703 ARMY nomination of Leah H. Georgieva, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN704 ARMY nomination of Nicholas R. Yetman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN705 ARMY nomination of Kevin L. Montgomery, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN706 ARMY nominations (9) beginning DAVID J. BEDELIS, and ending MICHAEL D. ZULTAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN707 ARMY nominations (3) beginning MOLLY E. KEITH, and ending DALLAS D. MCMULLEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN749 ARMY nominations (14) beginning STEVEN D. BRYANT, and ending D011339, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN750 ARMY nomination of Joseph A. St Pierre, II, which was received by the Senate