

This bill would have ensured more women could access the safe reproductive care that they need and deserve, including sometimes lifesaving abortion care.

Instead, my colleagues have turned their back on the millions of women in States where abortion is restricted. They have turned their backs on millions of women who are increasingly struggling to find OB/GYN care in their community. They have turned their back on OB/GYN residents and students who just want to learn how to care for their patients.

Without access to training and comprehensive reproductive care for our doctors, more women in States like my own will live in healthcare deserts, without the care they need to stay healthy, start a family, and get screenings for cancer and other serious illnesses.

My Reproductive Health Care Training Act would have ensured America's future doctors have the training they need to provide safe care, especially in States that have abortion restrictions.

This fight is not over, and I am in it for as long as it takes to restore a woman's freedom to make her own decisions about her health, her family, and her future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1297

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am here today with a very simple bill to protect doctors who are providing legal care against attacks from extreme out-of-state, out-of-touch politicians.

In my State, abortion is not only legal but protected by our State constitution. But when I talk to abortion providers in Spokane, where they see a lot of patients fleeing restrictive abortion bans from States like Idaho, they are terrified that they could face a lawsuit that will threaten their practice and their livelihood, just for doing their jobs, just for providing care their patients need—care that is, once again, completely legal in my State. We are talking about people who are following the law and simply want to provide care to their patients. This should be cut-and-dried.

So, Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1297, the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; and, 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 North Carolina.

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

The Supreme Court'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 is enriching our country from coast to coast.

But this bill would take us backward. This bill would, first of all, allow abortion on demand in pro-life States, so long as the patient is from another State. And that is crazy.

Second, 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. That also is crazy.

And, finally, this bill would violate the spirit of bipartisan Hyde protections by providing millions of taxpayer dollars to the abortion industry. That also is crazy.

I was elected to protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all, including for life for the unborn. But this bill puts more unborn lives in danger. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, let's be clear. Republicans who are now in the middle of trying to rewrite history and claim they only want State politicians overruling women—already an extreme position, by the way—just made clear that actually, on second thought, they have no problem whatsoever with politicians targeting doctors in States like mine, where abortion is legal. I think that pretty much gives the game away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2053

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, we are now 2 years into a world without Roe v. Wade, a world in which daughters have fewer rights than their mothers and their grandmothers did at their age.

In the 2 years since the Supreme Court overturned Roe, nearly half the States in our country have banned—or effectively banned—access to abortion. Women in those States have extremely limited options for accessing essential healthcare.

For many of these women, their only option for getting the reproductive care they need is going to another State. Last year alone, 171,000 Americans traveled across State lines to access an abortion.

Pro-choice States like Nevada are welcoming these women with open arms and providing them with the essential healthcare their own States have outlawed. In the last 2 years, the number of women coming to Southern Nevada from out of State to get abortion care has doubled.

But even though Nevada is a safe place for women who need healthcare, anti-choice politicians living outside my State are telling women: No, sorry, if you try to travel outside this State, we are going to prosecute anyone who helps you.

Elected officials in States like Tennessee and Texas and Alabama 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. Why? Because for these anti-choice politicians, this is about controlling women.

That is why today I am calling for passage of my Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act. Our legislation reaffirms that women have a fundamental right to interstate travel and makes it 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.

The Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act would also empower the Attorney General and anyone impacted to sue the anti-choice politicians who have violated their rights and put these barbaric restrictions in place. And it would protect healthcare providers in pro-choice States like mine—in Nevada—who help these women traveling from out of State.

Now, I wrote this bill 2 years ago, after the fall of Roe v. Wade, because, like many women across the country, I could see that the anti-choice movement would never stop trying to dismantle women's rights. And we are seeing that play out before our very eyes. We are hearing it today on the floor. We see it in our States.

Last month, Lauren Miller came here to Washington to testify in a Senate subcommittee hearing and tell her story. Lauren was a mother of one and was thrilled to find out that she was pregnant once again, this time with twins. She and her husband couldn't wait to grow their family. But at her 12-week ultrasound, Lauren learned the most devastating news: Half of one of her twins' brains was filled with fluid, and it was not going to survive. Lauren needed to abort this fetus to save the other viable twin and to protect her own life.

The problem was that Lauren lived in Texas, where abortions are almost entirely banned. Lauren's doctors wouldn't even talk to her about having a lifesaving abortion because they were so afraid of Texas's intentionally confusing laws, and they did not want to be prosecuted for practicing medicine to help her.

In her testimony, Lauren said:

My pregnancy was not my own. It belonged to the State.

Even after she ended up in the hospital at risk of organ damage to her kidneys and her brain, she still could not get the care that she needed. Lauren was forced to set aside several days and thousands of dollars while she was terribly ill so that she could fly to Colorado, just to access reproductive healthcare—just to access 21st century medicine.

And if that wasn't enough of a burden, Lauren and her husband were terrified to travel out of State because of Texas's bounty laws. In Texas, private

citizens can be paid by their government if they catch anyone who has helped someone access abortion care.

Oklahoma has adopted a similar law.

This is what happens when we give it to the States. This is what happened with the overturn of *Roe v. Wade*. When we are talking about States' rights, this is it. These laws mean people seeking abortions have to plan for their out-of-State travel as if they are doing something illegal.

Lauren and her husband had conversations about whether they should leave their cell phones at home and only use cash so they couldn't be tracked—in this day and age, like they were criminals of some sort, all because Lauren was dying from an entirely preventable health issue that she couldn't get care for in her own State.

When my colleagues and I first introduced the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act, anti-choice Republicans told us we were getting worked up over nothing. When we introduced and reintroduced it last year, anti-choice Republicans still told us we were overreaching. Anti-choice Republicans' main argument continues to be that it is just not necessary, that we are being hysterical, that we need to calm down.

Lauren Miller and her husband weren't being hysterical. She and her healthy son are living proof that we need to protect a woman's right to travel across State lines for abortion care.

My anti-choice colleagues can pretend this isn't happening right under their noses, but women across this country know the truth: Anti-choice politicians want to control women. They don't want women leaving the confines of their States with abortion bans, and they don't want us to have bodily autonomy.

Well, I stand with the vast majority of Americans who believe that politicians have no say in a woman's healthcare decisions. Women like Lauren Miller deserve access to life-saving care regardless of the State they live in. That is why we must pass the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act now. This is commonsense legislation to uphold a woman's constitutional right and freedom to interstate travel for healthcare.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 2053, the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act of 2023, 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 Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my pro-life colleagues and I most certainly do

not oppose any individual's freedom to travel across this great country, but we do take issue with this effort to give bad actors cover from prosecution.

While this bill poses as protecting pregnant women from prosecution, it would actually put vulnerable women and girls in harm's way if it became law. This would allow traffickers and abusive partners, parents, or relatives to take vulnerable women and girls across State lines to obtain abortions in an attempt to cover up their abuse.

These same abusers would also be given the freedom to travel across State lines to stockpile dangerous chemical abortion drugs to bring back to a life-affirming State. The chemical abortion regimen can pose dramatic complications that a woman or girl should never have to deal with, especially without medical care at her home.

According to the FDA's own label, these abortion drugs send roughly 1 in 25 women to the emergency room.

With this legislative effort before us, we see pro-abortion advocates promoting the scariest possible scenario by allowing a teenage girl to start the chemical abortion process across State lines with mifepristone, only to be sent back to her home State to deal with the physically and emotionally painful process alone.

We can and must do far better to protect women and girls from this heart-breaking and dangerous situation, and we certainly should not be shielding bad actors from prosecution.

It is for these reasons that I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, No. 1, let's be very clear: This legislation has nothing to do with shielding bad actors. And, No. 2, mifepristone is a safe and effective drug and has been for over 50 years.

So for my colleagues who have been on this path to limit access to healthcare for women and to reproductive freedom rights, to claim and make this misinformation and these scare tactics, when they are not true, does not do right by women.

Let me just say this. A majority of this country—including men, including Democrats, Republicans, non-partisans—support the right of a woman to choose. That is what this is about: continuing to fight for those rights.

A woman should have the freedom to access 21st century healthcare. Giving it to the States to make this decision is still giving it to elected officials to be in a room with women when they are making this decision. That is not the answer.

But until we can overturn *Dobbs*, we need legislation that is going to protect women so they can access this 21st century medication when they need it and come to States like mine without the fear of being prosecuted, and the

doctors need to be protected. That is what this is about, and it will always be about giving the freedom to women for their access to healthcare in this country.

And I will tell you this. My colleagues and I will never stop fighting for this. It is too important for our children, our young girls, and their future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, to recap, we just tried to pass some very straightforward legislation: a bill to protect a woman's right to travel across State lines to get the healthcare she needs, a bill to protect a doctor's right to provide legal abortion care to their patients without being threatened by an out-of-State extremist, and a bill to ensure more health professionals can receive critical training in comprehensive reproductive healthcare to help meet the dire need for providers.

Not a single one of these bills should be controversial. To oppose these bills, as Republicans have just done, is truly extreme. Are we going to let politicians hold women who want an abortion captive in their States? Seriously. If a woman wants to travel somewhere so she can make her own personal decision about her healthcare, are Republicans going to tie her hands? And if a doctor in a State like mine, where abortion is fully legal and even protected by our State constitution—if our doctors treat a patient from somewhere like Idaho—something that happens every day, by the way—do we want to let out-of-State extremist politicians threaten and try to punish them?

Again, we are talking about healthcare providers performing an abortion in a State where abortion is legal and protected. Republicans are all for States' rights until it comes to letting a woman make her own healthcare decisions.

When it comes to training, let's be clear: Abortion is healthcare, and in some cases, a patient's life may depend on whether they can get that care or not. That is why we need to make sure that every provider can get the comprehensive reproductive health training that they need by supporting medical training programs that are doing this important work.

It is incredibly frustrating to me that, so far, Republicans have blocked these proposals from moving forward. It seems, when it comes to an abortion, there is no bill too simple for Republicans to oppose. There is no right too basic for Republicans to attack and no problem too important for Republicans to ignore.

Republicans haven't just voted down our efforts to restore abortion rights in every State, they have voted against the right to birth control; they have voted against the right to IVF; and now they have opposed letting patients

leave their States for care, letting doctors provide legal care to anyone who comes to them, and helping healthcare providers get the training they need to save a life.

But let's be clear: No matter this outcome, no matter how far Republicans follow the most extreme anti-abortion voices in their party, Democrats are going to keep standing against them, pushing for reproductive rights, and fighting for patients.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

REMEMBERING JAMES M. INHOFE

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. President, today, I take to the floor for the first time. I really am not one to speak a whole lot on the floor. My time in the House was very limited as to how many times I spoke on the House floor. Then, being in the Senate, this is my first time to speak, but it comes on an occasion that I feel is, I guess, the right time to speak.

A gentleman whom I took great pride in knowing, whom I referred to quite often as a grandfather, Senator Jim Inhofe, passed away, unfortunately, this morning.

And I was asked right off the bat, "Would you be willing to do some interviews?" on it. And then, obviously, we were asked to speak on the floor.

And I didn't even know what to say. How do you describe Senator Jim Inhofe, right? How do you describe his family—Miss Kay, who, from the first time I ever met her, she made me feel as comfortable as if I was her own child, just someone who took time to pet on me and love on me when I was trying to learn just to be in politics because politics was new.

Senator Inhofe would often take me by the hand—literally, by the hand—and say: Hey, listen to me, son. And over time he became quite a mentor—I mean, quite a mentor of mine.

And I get asked all the time: How do you plan on filling the shoes of Senator Inhofe? And I say: How do you fill the shoes of a gentleman whose middle name was "Mountain"? How fitting is that, right? Senator James Mountain Inhofe, because he was a mountain of a man.

He blazed his own trail. He was full of grit and tenacity. You always knew where he stood. I never doubted what his thoughts were. He would tell me right off the bat. When it was time for a decision to be made, he would get the delegation together. He would come in, and he wasn't someone that demanded you to go with him. He just let you know where he was at and why he was right. And you found a lot of respect in

that. At the same time, if he didn't agree with you, he let you know he didn't agree with you. But you can respect a guy that you always know where he stands.

So it saddens me deeply to know that, today, this Earth is less one gentleman that I think we all learned from. Everybody in this Chamber who knew James or Senator Inhofe knew a guy as a friend. You knew he was someone that you could trust.

I remember one time—it was in 2016—my wife and I, we were making a decision if we were going to continue to stay in public office. Quite frankly, I was done. I had my fill. I came from the private sector. And just politics, in itself, to me, was not something that I enjoyed. I was ready to just throw in the towel.

And Senator Inhofe called me. He says: Hey, come into my office, which, coming over from my little Senate office in Longworth, I went into this Taj Mahal office of Senator Inhofe's, and I just was in shock.

And he said: Do me a favor. He says: Don't leave yet. And I looked at him. He said: Just give it time. He said: I understand it is bad right now. I understand it is rough. He said: But take it from a guy who came out of the private sector—from me—who at that time had been in office almost 55 years. He said: Take it from me, a guy that came out of the private sector, how frustrating it can be. But it can also be the most rewarding thing you will ever do. It can be more satisfying than anything you have ever built if you will just stay put because, I promise you, it will get better.

And I can't say it has actually gotten better, but I can say that he was right, because it is gratifying. What he did is he allowed me to change my focus from understanding that all the outside distractions that can take place, all the nasty things that can happen on social media, the things that can be written about you that are out of your control, things that people automatically assume about you because you are in public office—that can all easily go away if you will stay focused on what you were elected to do, which is to serve the great State of Oklahoma and just focus on constituent service, focus on building things for the State, focus on staying passionate about what your passion is, and you can create such a legacy for yourself.

I don't think Senator Inhofe ever set out to build a legacy that his name is built upon. He always wanted to serve, from being mayor of the city of Tulsa, to being a Congressman for three terms, to serving in the Senate for almost 30 years. All he did every day was work hard for Oklahoma, and I am grateful to get to know him.

His family, the whole time he served—I have just got to brag about his family because, the whole time he served—which was a big thing for me too—it was, how do you balance the political life and the family life? Because

if you knew Jim, Jim was—or Senator Inhofe—always going home. Miss Kay was his priority. If she was ill, wasn't feeling good, he was headed that way. And every time I talked to him on the plane, when we sat beside each other, when we would land, the first person he would call would be Miss Kay.

And he would want to know how she is doing and want to make sure that this project is being complete. And sometimes he would even talk to me about some of the projects going on to his house. It was always a priority.

And for me, who had six kids at home—and at the time when I got in office, my oldest was 7 years old—that was a concern of mine of how you can balance it.

And he says: MARKWAYNE, I have been doing this—like I said, at that time, when we first had that conversation, he had been in office for over 50 years. He says: I have done it, and I think I have raised some pretty good kids. His kids loved him. His wife loved him. His grandkids loved him.

And not to talk about the way that he necessarily left the world, but I think he left it the way he would want to, a guy that was always moving. He was always on the run. He always had a project. He never sat still. To be able to be here one day, go through a little trouble for a maybe a few days, and leave this Earth and people loving you and you had a great reputation—I don't know how any of us would rather be remembered.

And so, while I take the podium for the first time, I just want to say again, it is an honor to walk in that trail that he blazed because, as I said, I am not ever going to fill his shoes. But he built a trail, as people want to refer to it, as a mountain man. What did the mountain man do, right? The mountain man went up, and he blazed trails—new trails. He was in territory that no one else knew about. He blazed a trail that I could build a highway on, and I have full intentions of doing that.

So to Miss Kay, to his kids, and to his grandkids and to all his family, thank you for giving so much of your time to allow Senator Inhofe to serve. Thank you for giving him to me and allowing me to call him—even though he sometimes got mad at me because he thought I was talking about his age. I wasn't. I meant it in an affectionate way. Thank you for allowing me to call him my grandfather, because I lost both my grandfathers. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to know him and to know your family. May God bless you.

I think it is pretty evident when I say this: We are all going to miss him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. I ask unanimous consent that the 5:45 vote occur now.

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the