

NOT VOTING—8

Cruz	Mullin	Scott (FL)
Markey	Romney	Sinema
Menendez	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM FOR WOMEN ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session and resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 4554, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 4554, a bill to express support for protecting access to reproductive health care after the *Dobbs v. Jackson* decision on June 24, 2022.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Mississippi.

FARM BILL

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Madam President, we are now well into the month of July and less than 3 months away from the current Farm Bill extension expiring. As such, I would like to bring renewed focus on the framework proposed by my colleague and Ranking Member of the Senate Agriculture Committee. I commend my friend Senator BOOZMAN from Arkansas for presenting us with a framework that answers the call of farmers, ranchers, stakeholders, and taxpayers across the country.

For the greater part of 2 years, we have heard time and time again from those who elected us to be here: "In the next Farm Bill, Congress must"—and these are some of the things they say we must do: Strengthen the farm safety net—ARC, PLC, disaster assistance, and crop insurance, among other important safety net mechanisms; enhance conservation programs, especially those designed for our working lands, such as the CSP and EQIP programs; provide greater opportunities for U.S. agriculture in the global marketplace; ensure that our domestic food assistance programs serve as a hand up and not a handout; offer better access to credit and financing, particularly for young and beginning farmers; dedicate adequate resources to our rural communities, which are built around agriculture; invest more in agricultural research, in which America is currently lagging behind our competitors and adversaries, despite having the brightest minds in the world and a storied history of innovation; modernize existing policies pertaining to forestry, energy, and horticulture among many others. In short, put more farm in the Farm Bill.

The farm bill framework released by our Senate Agriculture Committee

ranking member would achieve all of these things and in a bipartisan, fiscally responsible manner.

It is our responsibility in Congress to listen to those who know best about what they need to make a living so they can continue to feed our Nation and the world. When the Subcommittee on Commodities, Risk Management, and Trade conducted a hearing last year on producer perspectives of the farm safety net, a producer described the current farm safety net as being "two inches above the concrete." That is insufficient in today's farm economy, where producers face extraordinary volatility, historic inflation, record high input costs, catastrophic natural disasters, and geopolitical tensions that disrupt markets.

Times are changing. New challenges and threats to rural America emerge every day. This is why Congress revisits this important multiyear legislation: to keep what is working, fix what is not, and eliminate what is no longer necessary.

I commend the House Agriculture Committee for advancing a strong, commonsense farm bill proposal out of committee, and I commend our Senate Ag Committee chair for all of her efforts throughout this process.

But the bottom line is it takes time to move away from partisan disagreements. It is time to do that and, instead, work on finding common ground. It is time to graduate from concepts and proposals and, instead, start advancing actual legislation. Simply put, it is time for Congress to enact a new farm bill, one that our farmers, ranchers, and rural America have been asking for, for quite some time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Arkansas.

REMEMBERING JAMES M. INHOFE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, it is with a heavy heart that I come to the floor to pay tribute to former Oklahoma Senator Jim Inhofe, a dear friend who honorably served the people of the Sooner State.

Senator Inhofe led a life of public service, first as a soldier in the U.S. Army and then in several other roles in elected office at all levels of government. It was evident how much he truly loved leading and representing his community, the people of Oklahoma, and our country.

I had the honor and privilege of serving with Senator Inhofe and developing a relationship based not just on our shared responsibilities and interest but also on our faith and our values. We originally met when I was a Member of the House of Representatives and had the opportunity to join one of his congressional delegation trips.

As someone I grew to deeply respect and admire, his encouragement for me to run for the Senate was a very important part of why I chose to launch the campaign, and I consider it a blessing that I got to work alongside Senator Inhofe for 12 years together in this Chamber.

He was a leader on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee when I was a junior member, and I learned so much from simply observing him. But he was also gracious enough to view me as a partner.

A decade ago, I invited the Senator to Fort Smith, AR, my home town, a community bordering Oklahoma, and he took me up on the offer. Our States are neighbors.

So, naturally, we worked together on a number of initiatives. Those included advocating for infrastructure improvements, such as the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System and a future interstate designation from U.S. Route 412 in Arkansas to I-35 in Oklahoma, and the list goes on and on and on.

I often cited Senator Inhofe's leadership on the EPW Committee as a great example of bipartisanship. He and his counterpart, former California Senator Barbara Boxer, came from very, very different backgrounds and had different beliefs but found common ground and accomplished truly remarkable feats, like rewriting a chemical safety law and crafting the first long-term highway bill in a decade. That simply was not moving. Both of them had a tremendous sense of responsibility regarding infrastructure and believed very strongly. So they were able to overcome their differences and do what many felt like couldn't be done.

Another thing I learned about him while traveling together was that he maintained a very, very rigorous schedule while on congressional delegation trips—in fact, in every facet of his life. And they were usually whirlwinds. And there was more than one occasion when he set out on a morning power walk and only find his way back to the group—he is like me; he had no sense of direction at all—with the help of landmarks and locals who probably had no idea he was an influential statesman and dignitary.

I truly enjoyed traveling with him on multiple codels as we met so many American troops serving abroad, while learning more how to better support their needs and missions defending the interests of our country.

Knowing Senator Inhofe at all meant you understood that he and his wife Kay had a very special marriage, a very special relationship. They filled their home with love and family, and those priorities informed everything he stood for.

My wife Cathy and I will be forever grateful for Jim and Kay's friendship. Our prayers are with Kay and the entire Inhofe family as they honor the life and legacy of their beloved husband, father, and grandfather.

Senator Inhofe was someone that my former coach at the University of Arkansas Frank Broyles would describe as a giver, not a taker. There is no better compliment that we can pay him than that.

May he rest in eternal peace with our Lord and Savior.

And with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Hawaii.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized to speak prior to the scheduled rollcall vote: Hirono for up to 10 minutes, Stabenow for up to 5 minutes, Klobuchar for up to 10 minutes, Murray for up to 5 minutes, and Schumer for up to 5 minutes.

Further, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 4554, be waived; finally, that the cloture motion with respect to the Kiko nomination be withdrawn and, at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Kiko nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The junior Senator from Hawaii.

REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM FOR WOMEN ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, after Dobbs came down, we worried about what a post-Dobbs America would look like. Would other reproductive freedoms be attacked and stripped away, piece by piece, across the country? Now, 2 years later, we know the answer is yes.

In Dobbs, the Supreme Court “return[ed] the issue of abortion” to the States and eliminated a constitutional right women in our country had relied on for nearly 50 years.

We often refer to the States as laboratories of democracy. Sadly, these laboratories are now experimenting on women with dystopian results. This hellish experimentation has resulted in devastating consequences for women and families across the country who are now subject to State-imposed abortion bans.

As a result of over 20 States enacting abortion bans—some without exception for rape or incest—women all over our country are being forced to travel far distances for abortion care or, worse, to continue pregnancies regardless of the risks. Their stories are horrifying—stories like that of Kate Cox, a mother of two in Texas whose pregnancy was threatening her life and her ability to have more children in the future.

Despite her deteriorating physical condition, Texas officials ruled that she wasn’t sick enough to get an abortion, forcing her to travel out of State to receive the lifesaving care she needed.

While Kate has the ability to travel, so many other women in her condition do not and are forced to suffer the unimaginable consequences of Republican’s obsession with power and control.

What is more, healthcare workers in States with abortion bans are living under a constant threat of criminal prosecution. When patients in States with abortion bans present with signs

of a miscarriage, doctors are unable to provide emergency treatment—going against their legal and professional duty of care and years of expert training. As a result, many of these providers are fleeing their practices, contributing to reproductive healthcare deserts all across the country.

The cruelty of Dobbs has also resulted in an increase in infant mortality in States with abortion bans, as women are forced to carry fetuses with fatal birth defects to term.

Let’s be clear. Abortion bans aren’t about protecting anyone. They are about the right’s obsession with power and control, plain and simple.

But while Republicans continue their march toward a nationwide abortion ban, they refuse to be honest with the American people. Time after time, Republicans have come to this floor insisting that they support women’s health, only to turn around and vote against bill after bill that would do just that. Despite their rhetoric, they voted en masse against the right to contraception, the right to IVF, and have consistently blocked any effort in this Chamber to protect women’s fundamental rights. But still my Republican colleagues insist they stand with women.

Today, they have the opportunity to put their money where their mouths are. The Reproductive Freedom for Women Act is straightforward. It simply expresses support for protecting access to reproductive health care. The bill is one-page long and does not codify Roe or enact any policy changes.

This should be a no-brainer for anyone who actually supports women and our right to control our own bodies. But if past is prologue, it is safe to say Republicans will vote against this bill today, only to insist tomorrow that they are the party of freedom. Give me a break.

Democrats, meanwhile, are determined to restore, protect, and strengthen reproductive rights, and we will not stop fighting until we succeed in this. That is why today I am proud to stand with my fellow Democrats in voting for the Reproductive Freedom for Women Act to support reproductive rights and health care for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I am really proud to be joining the senior Senator from Hawaii and other colleagues who will be coming to the floor to talk about such an important topic and bill as the Reproductive Freedom for Women Act.

We know that for 50 years, *Roe v. Wade* protected our freedom to make our own healthcare decisions, and then 2 years ago, it was gone. I can’t believe that today’s young women, including my daughter and granddaughters, have fewer freedoms than their mothers and their grandmothers did.

Frankly, we are furious in Michigan. Do you want to know just how furious?

Well, in Michigan, we turned our anger into action, and in November of 2022, we had the largest voter turnout for a midterm election ever. One of the measures on the ballot enshrined a right to reproductive freedom in our Michigan Constitution. It passed by a strong 13-point margin because Michiganders understand that healthcare decisions should be made by individual women—not by judges, not by politicians.

By the way, we hear all the time on the other side that it is a debate between, should it be Federal politicians or State politicians? Neither. Neither. This is about individuals having the freedom to make their own healthcare decisions. I can’t believe we have to debate this in 2024 in America, but a lot of folks just haven’t gotten the message yet.

Today, 22 States now have near total bans or severe restrictions on abortion services, and that means one out of three women now lives under an extreme or dangerous abortion ban. We know who is to blame for this because they brag about it all the time: Donald Trump and the MAGA Republicans.

Since the fall of Roe, Republicans have continued their assault on access to contraception, on IVF, a choice for those who desperately want a baby and need some additional help from science to help make that happen, to severe and total restrictions on abortion services.

Unfortunately, MAGA Republicans want total control of our lives and total control of our fundamental freedoms. Last month, Democrats acted to protect these freedoms for women. Unfortunately, every time we brought bills to the Senate floor, Republicans blocked them, and unfortunately, we know they won’t stop there. We know that the Republican Party, if they have their way, will create a national abortion ban, which means Michigan’s constitutional protections that people worked very hard to achieve—hundreds of thousands of signatures, working hard, voting to put this protection for our freedoms into the Michigan Constitution—will all be ripped away if that happens.

Imagine what this would mean for a woman who learns that the pregnancy she desperately wants is not viable and her own life is at risk. This is actually happening, unfortunately, all the time right now in the States that have severe restrictions.

I will never forget hearing a woman talking about her own experience of being told she wasn’t close enough to death to get care in the emergency room. She had to go and sit in her car until she was so close to death that they felt they could treat her.

Doctors are now talking to their attorney before they are talking to other doctors or women and their families and so on. We are seeing so many things happen—so many things now. We have already seen one study showing in Texas that there has been an 8-

percent increase in infant mortality. That means children don't live until their first birthday because something has happened. So who decides what happens to someone in that situation—the woman, supported by her family and her doctor, or a rightwing Supreme Court and Republicans in the U.S. Senate or any other elected body?

Today, we have an incredibly important vote. It will tell us where every single Member of this Chamber stands. Do you think women should have the basic freedom to make decisions about our own health—that anyone should have the freedom to make decisions about their own health? It is as simple as that.

We know where we stand. We are working every day to defend our freedom to make decisions about our own healthcare; to make sure that it is not a politician, that it is not a judge; that it is women, their faith, their families, their doctors; that people who are directly involved are making those decisions.

The women of this country should have the freedom to make our own decisions about our own healthcare, our own lives, and our own futures. That is what this vote is about. And we are not going to give up until we have those freedoms fully protected.

I would urge colleagues to pass the Reproductive Freedom for Women Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

MS. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I join my colleague from Michigan and all of the other Senators who have spoken out on this topic today to say that now is the time to protect women's reproductive freedom. I thank Leader SCHUMER for organizing this group of Senators, and I thank Senator MURRAY for her work on this. I thank you as our newest Senator for being part of this.

A few weeks ago, America marked 2 years since the Supreme Court overturned half a century of precedent and stripped away every woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions, going 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. No, they don't want our colleagues sitting in the waiting room.

In the wake of that disastrous decision, women across the country remain at the mercy of a patchwork of State laws that are creating chaos when it comes to accessing reproductive health care. Today, 22 States have passed laws that fully or partially ban abortion, and one-third of women of reproductive age live under extreme and dangerous bans.

For instance, just 2 weeks ago, in our neighboring State of Iowa, right below Minnesota, the State supreme court allowed a 6-week abortion ban to take effect. You couple that with what has gone on in South Dakota and North Dakota, and you understand why, in

Minnesota, clinics have moved across the border. That is what is happening in every State in this Nation right now.

In States across the country, women are also being forced away from emergency rooms and left to travel hundreds of miles for healthcare.

I think of the woman in Oklahoma who was told that she needed to wait in the parking lot until she was much sicker or, as the doctor put it, "on the verge of a heart attack."

I also think of the woman from Louisiana who was turned away from two emergency rooms during a miscarriage because the doctors feared prosecution for providing care under stringent abortion laws.

I don't think any of us will ever forget the heartbreaking story of the 10-year-old girl in Ohio who had to go to Indiana in order to get a legal abortion after she was raped—a 10-year-old girl. People didn't believe the story. Remember that? And then it turned out it was completely true. They said it was a hoax. It wasn't. It is what is happening right now in America.

Doctors are being threatened with prosecution for doing their jobs, and access to fertility treatment is at risk for families who are desperately trying to get pregnant.

Like many of my colleagues, I did a series of Fourth of July parades over the last week. I think I did eight of them. In nearly every parade, someone came up with their child—a little baby, sometimes more grown up—and said: She wouldn't be here, he wouldn't be here without IVF.

But right now, all of those things that we have expected for so long are at risk—access to contraception, access to abortion drugs that are safe in dozens of countries. While the Supreme Court gave us a temporary reprieve in the mifepristone case, we know that a number of other States are now gearing up to bring similar lawsuits because that was just thrown out based on a legal requirement, a legal standing for who could bring the case, not actually on the merits.

This is our current reality, but it doesn't have to be our future. This is a pivotal moment for America. Are we going to move forward and protect freedom, which has long been a hallmark of our Nation, or are we going go further backwards in history? Not just to the 1950s but to the 1850s.

The Supreme Court's decision threatens women's health and freedom no matter where you live in this country, and it demands a swift response. All three branches of government have a responsibility to protect people's rights, and if one branch doesn't do its job, then it is up to another to step in. That means it is on Congress to codify Roe v. Wade into law.

Every American woman should be able to get the care she needs without navigating unnecessary bans, and the choice of whether and when to start a family should be just that.

While we are here today, I also see Senator MURRAY is on the floor, and I want to thank her for organizing yesterday's group of speakers on important legislation related to reproductive freedom.

In addition to codifying Roe v. Wade into law, we need to pass other commonsense measures, like my bill, the UPHOLD Privacy Act, which we tried to move forward, thanks to Senator MURRAY, yesterday. Unfortunately, it was blocked. This bill sets limits on how companies can use people's health data. This is particularly important following recent troubling reports of companies collecting and sharing data related to reproductive health care.

Just this year, we learned that a company allegedly tracked people's visits to nearly 600 Planned Parenthood locations across the country and provided that data for an anti-abortion ad campaign. That is just wrong. No one can believe that it is happening today in America, but it is. With a woman's right to reproductive care under attack, it is even more dangerous. That is why enacting commonsense limits on how companies can use people's personal data is so critical right now.

All of this comes down to one question: Who should get to make personal healthcare decisions for women—the woman herself with her doctor, in a family consultation, or a politician whom she is never going to meet and who isn't going to be looking out for her?

To me, the answer is clear. As our country enters its third year without Roe v. Wade, I continue to stand with my colleagues in the fight for reproductive freedom.

We stand on the side of the American people who have come together, time and time again—in Kentucky, where they voted for a Governor who is standing up for reproductive healthcare; in Kansas—in the middle of the prairie, where no one expected it—the first real test of this, where Democrats and Republicans voted on the side of freedom; in Ohio, in a referendum, where, by 11 points, the people of Ohio stood up for freedom; or in the legislative races in Virginia or in a congressional race on Long Island or in the Wisconsin Supreme Court race. The message is clear as to where the American people are. This isn't about red States or blue States. Think of the States I just listed. This is about freedom.

So we refuse to back down. We refuse to give up. We refuse to settle for a reality in which our daughters have fewer rights than their mothers and grandmothers. This may be our reality right now; but, colleagues, it does not have to be our future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, today, we are going to vote on a bill that offers a simple statement of values: Do you support a woman's freedom to make her own healthcare decisions?

For the vast majority of Americans, the answer is yes—without question. We know that because the American people have been speaking out loudly and repeatedly and at every opportunity to oppose Republicans' extreme abortion bans.

The record here is remarkable and unmistakable: Since Trump and Republicans succeeded at overturning *Roe v. Wade* and ripping away a constitutional right from our daughters and granddaughters, every single time abortion rights have been on the ballot, abortion rights have won—every time.

But the American people have not just been speaking with their own votes; they have been using their voices and sharing their own, personal stories of the nightmares that Republicans' abortion bans have put them through: women denied medical care for a miscarriage because of abortion bans; women turned away from hospitals because their doctors' hands were tied until they lost over half their blood, until their husbands found them unconscious on the floor, until the only option was an emergency hysterectomy or, tragically, until it was simply too late; children who couldn't get abortion care after being raped; a teenager delivering a baby, while clutching a teddy bear, being forced through a pregnancy by Republican politicians.

This isn't some dystopian prediction. This has all happened recently in the United States of America because of Donald Trump and Republicans' anti-abortion extremism.

Just last month, *The New York Times* profiled the story of one mother in Idaho who woke up with heavy bleeding in her 20th week of pregnancy. She was leaking amniotic fluid. She went to the emergency room. She was told there was nothing they could do to help. "Sorry." Because of Idaho's extreme abortion ban, it meant that any doctor who gave her the abortion care she so desperately needed would be risking the loss of his medical license and jail time and heavy fines. The best they could do was give her an emergency flight to another State. And when she arrived, nurses remembered her saying: I just need to stay alive so I can be around for my two other kids.

That same hospital in Idaho has already had to airlift six pregnant women out of the State for emergency abortion care this year. That is just one hospital in one State and one horrific variation of the many nightmares that are happening on loop across the country as a direct result of the Republicans' abortion bans.

I am going to keep saying it: A forced pregnancy does not have to make headlines to make someone's life a living hell.

This is not an issue that Republicans can run away from no matter how much they try to.

Donald Trump—a convicted felon and a liar—is trying to tell us he doesn't know anything about Project 2025.

That is the playbook that has been written by some of his top advisers for him. He may as well be saying he has no idea who named Trump Tower. We all know Donald Trump ended *Roe v. Wade*. We all know Republicans championed that for decades, and we know that Trump will absolutely ban abortion nationwide.

Republicans do not get to pretend they support the health of the mother while ignoring the horror stories happening today across the country and urging the Supreme Court to rule against ensuring abortion is available in emergencies.

Republicans do not get to pretend that they support IVF and birth control while championing a national fetal personhood bill and voting down bills to protect the right to IVF and birth control.

Republicans do not get to pretend they only want State politicians controlling women's most personal decisions while supporting national abortion bans, including the fetal personhood bill I just mentioned; supporting efforts to strike down access to medication abortion nationwide; blocking efforts to protect women who might travel out of State for care; and even blocking protections for doctors in States like mine where abortion is legal.

I cannot stress enough how transparently unserious it is for Trump and Republicans to pretend they are somehow returning abortion to the people when, in reality, they are doing the exact opposite. Republicans are giving politicians power that once belonged to individual women—letting politicians force women to stay pregnant—and they are trying to sell that as giving people a bigger voice on this issue.

Do Republicans really think Americans are that stupid? Do Republicans really think they can take away a constitutional right and convince us it is a win for freedom? That is insulting.

Here is an idea: Do you want to really give the people a say on abortion? How about you let each person decide with their doctors what is right for them? How is that for small government? How is that for letting people decide?

If Republicans really want to let people make their own decisions on abortions, that is news to me. It would certainly be news to the countless women who have had that choice ripped away from them by Republican politicians over the past 2 years.

But they have a chance to prove it right here, today, right now, when we vote on my Reproductive Freedom for Women Act. This is a plain up-or-down vote on whether you support women being able to make their own reproductive healthcare decisions. It doesn't force anything. It doesn't cost anything. It is, actually, just a half-page bill simply saying that women should have the basic freedom to make their own decisions about their healthcare. Seriously, that is it. It is as simple as it gets.

If you care at all—even the tiniest bit—about protecting women's access to healthcare and allowing women to make their own decisions about their pregnancies, you should support this bill.

Now, make no mistake, I am not holding my breath here today, but I am going to be holding Republicans accountable. Donald Trump is trying to rewrite his abortion record, but I will not let him or anyone else off the hook. If Republicans are going to force women to stay pregnant, we are going to force them to be honest with the American people about their extreme position.

By the way, Democrats are going to keep fighting to restore the rights the American people have been so clear that they want back.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MR. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, let me thank the Senator from Washington State, the Senate's President pro tempore, for her amazing leadership on this issue. She is the lead sponsor of the legislation and is on so many other issues across the spectrum but particularly on women's rights and women's healthcare. There is no stronger clarion voice than the Senator from Washington, so I thank her for that.

Now, today, Senate Republicans must answer a simple question: Do they believe that women should have the right to make their own healthcare choices—yes or no?

The Reproductive Freedom for Women Act is exceedingly simple. All it does is express support for a woman's right to choose. That is it—no more, no less. It should be an easy "yes" vote.

My Republican colleagues have a choice: Vote yes, and stand with women who want their rights protected or stand with Donald Trump and the MAGA radicals who want to see those rights taken away.

We know where the American people stand on freedom of choice: Over 80 percent of Americans, including two-thirds of Republicans, agree that healthcare decisions, including abortion, should be between a woman and her doctor. But Americans are rightfully worried that reproductive rights are becoming extinct in this country. They see what is happening at the Supreme Court. They see the attacks against women's rights in States like Texas and Florida and Alabama and Idaho and beyond.

The American people want to know where their Senators stand on freedom of choice. By voting on reproductive freedoms, we are moving the issue forward because it is very important and very reasonable for Members to be asked to take a position on such a vital issue. If Senate Republicans genuinely trust women to make their own reproductive choices, then they should not block this bill today.

I want to tell our Republican colleagues: The American people are

watching how we vote. You can run, but you can't hide. All of America is going to know whether you are for women's reproductive rights or not by this vote—no excuses. This is it. They—the American people—want to see who will defend their fundamental freedoms and who will not.

Again, let me thank Senator MURRAY for leading on this bill. Let me thank every female Senator on our side of the aisle for cosponsoring it along with me.

We need a "yes" vote.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 4554, a bill to express support for protecting access to reproductive health care after the Dobbs v. Jackson decision on June 24, 2022.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Christopher A. Coons, Jack Reed, Margaret Wood Hassan, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie Hirono, Thomas R. Carper, Tina Smith, Sheldon Whitehouse, Gary C. Peters, Tammy Duckworth, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Catherine Cortez Masto, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 4554, a bill to express support for protecting access to reproductive health care after the Dobbs v. Jackson decision on June 24, 2022, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Baldwin	Casey	Heinrich
Bennet	Collins	Hickenlooper
Blumenthal	Coons	Hirono
Booker	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Brown	Duckworth	Kelly
Butler	Durbin	King
Cantwell	Fetterman	Klobuchar
Cardin	Gillibrand	Lujan
Carper	Hassan	Manchin

Merkley
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Reed

Rosen
Sanders
Schatz
Shaheen
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Van Hollen

Warner
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—44

Barrasso
Blackburn
Boozman
Braun
Britt
Budd
Capito
Cassidy
Cornyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Daines
Ernst
Fischer

Graham
Grassley
Hagerty
Hawley
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee
Lummis
Marshall
McConnell
Moran
Paul

Ricketts
Risch
Rounds
Rubio
Schmitt
Schumer
Scott (SC)
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Tuberville
Vance
Wicker
Young

NOT VOTING—7

Cruz
Markey
Menendez

Mullin
Romney
Scott (FL)
Sinema

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 44.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 748

Mr. LEE. Madam President, European capitals have grown far too accustomed to U.S.-subsidized security for way too long. It is an imbalance that has allowed Europe to enjoy constant protection without bearing the risks or the costs.

Today, as Washington hosts the annual NATO summit, we find ourselves at a crossroads. NATO, now turning 75, is an alliance with major issues. Despite the rhetoric from President Biden and his handlers, the simple truth is that we cannot afford to consider admitting Ukraine, nor should the United States be making overtures about future membership.

As NATO gathers on our soil, the United States needs to be forthright with our allies that the United States cannot sustain the massive levels of support for Ukraine, and any discussion of Ukraine's membership cannot be on the table.

We have challenges right on our front door that need our immediate attention: the crisis at our southern border and the credible military threat from China in our hemisphere and the Pacific. Those two things combined are things we have to address, urgently so.

The situation at hand demands that we prioritize our own borders and our own deterrence efforts in higher priority theaters. We simply do not have

the luxury of infinite military resources, capabilities, or personnel, and we do no favors to our European allies by minimizing the painful reality that the United States must prioritize our own security needs. We need to be honest with our allies about the truth.

The European security environment has drastically changed since the 2-percent defense spending pledge was made a decade ago at the 2014 Wales NATO summit. Our alliance's refusal to commit to raising this baseline to 3 percent or above, which is necessary to meet today's strategic demands, places a disproportionate burden on the American people. Our military and diplomatic leadership have admitted that 2 percent is insufficient; however, commitments to increasing defense spending have not been made at this year's summit.

While European domestic budgets focus on massively funding free healthcare, shortened workweeks, social welfare programs, climate alarmism, and woke DEI activities, the United States still far exceeds the wealthiest European NATO allies in military contributions to Ukraine, as this graph demonstrates.

While Americans are pinching pennies, we are sending our tax dollars to fight in a faraway war. The burden must shift to Brussels, Berlin, Paris, and London. Instead of confronting reality, however, the Biden administration recently inked a 10-year security agreement with Ukraine, promising that "Ukraine's future is in NATO" and asserts that there are no limits to U.S. aid.

This is pure fantasy. To start, Ukraine does not meet NATO's membership standards—not even close, not by a mile. Our defense industrial base and dwindling stockpiles demonstrate that there are practical limits to what the United States can reasonably do for Ukraine.

The agreement also leaves open the possibility that U.S. forces will be used to "confront any future aggression against the territorial integrity" of Ukraine, once again sidestepping Congress and the American people to put us on a path to a direct shooting war with a nuclear-armed adversary. This is armchair brinkmanship by politicians whose children won't be the ones dying. The supposed purpose of NATO is to protect its members and prevent war, not bring us closer to it.

Despite these obvious flaws, the Biden administration sought to make it deliberately difficult to terminate this proposed 10-year agreement.

My resolution condemns this 10-year bilateral security agreement with Ukraine. It affirms that the agreement has no force of law without Senate ratification and rejects it as a bridge to Ukraine's NATO membership.

The Biden administration cannot be allowed to skirt the Constitution, to relegate Congress to the periphery, or to tie the hands of future administrations to entertain the fantasies of

Ukraine joining NATO. We must prioritize our national interests and uphold the principles and protections of our Constitution.

It is time for Congress to remind the alliance and the Biden administration that we hold the power to make treaties, to extend NATO membership, and that overtures made to Ukraine and our European allies are not “irreversible.”

Ukraine’s membership is not set in stone. If Ukraine is in, the United States should be out.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign relations be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 748. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would simply observe that this resolution is, in fact, not a sense of the Senate, and it is wrong to suggest that a majority of Senators in any way agree with this resolution.

It is also a simple fact that the dictator, the war criminal Vladimir Putin thinks he can wait out the clock. This resolution would close the door to continued support for Ukraine. Taking bilateral agreements off the table would simply bind American’s hands.

Victory against the dictator Putin must be our position. Ukraine can’t win without the support of its friends. Putin knows this, and, surely, my friend the senior Senator from Utah also knows this.

We should not pass this resolution because it would hand Putin a rhetorical victory and we should not permit that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Is there objection?

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, it is interesting. Earlier today, there was a large bipartisan group of Senators that met with President Zelenskyy of Ukraine. We expressed our bipartisan support for the United States continuing to support Ukraine’s efforts to repeal the outrageous attack to their sovereignty by Mr. Putin and Russia. There was bipartisan support for Ukraine because we recognized that Ukraine is the frontline in the defense of our democracy. Ukraine is not asking us for our soldiers; they are asking us for our support.

So I want to start, in my concerns of the unanimous consent request offered by the Senator from Utah, in that the support for the defense of Ukraine enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support here in the U.S. Senate. That is why I was pleased to join Senator WICKER on the floor. When the supplemental fund-

ing bill came up for a vote, 79 Senators—Republicans and Democrats alike—backed it.

Why is that? It is because most Senators understand what is at stake. It is because we understand that Ukraine is not only fighting for themselves; they are fighting for the entire Western World. It is because we understand, if Putin is successful in Ukraine, it will endanger our security interests and those of some of our closest European allies.

Yes, they are asking for financial and military support. Their success—Ukraine’s success—will help make it possible for our soldiers not to be in another war in Europe. So supporting Ukraine in this fight against one of the most dangerous adversaries in the world is clearly in the national security interests of the United States.

I also want to address one of the arguments offered by my colleague from Utah: the idea that this Executive agreement should have no effect unless submitted to the Senate for advice and consent. Multiple administrations have used Executive agreements to advance diplomatic goals that are in the U.S.’s national security interests. Along with my colleagues, I support this bilateral agreement because it does just that; it advances Ukraine’s interests and our own interests in national security.

Unlike other administrations, in the case of this agreement, the Biden administration proactively reached out to Members and staff in both Chambers of both parties to share the parameters of the negotiations while they were underway. They solicited reactions and input from Congress, and they took some of our input in regards to the final negotiations. Unlike the practices of previous administrations, the Biden administration posted the text of the agreement on the State Department’s website the day it was signed.

We in Congress were kept up to date on parallel negotiations with Ukraine by 31 other nations. They were negotiating with 31 countries in bilateral security agreements so that we could give comprehensive help to Ukraine in its defense of democracy. Many are in NATO, but there are also other countries that the U.S. has rallied to support Ukraine. So far, Ukraine has signed 20 bilateral security deals. They include concrete provisions on long-term military and financial aid. They include the training of Ukrainian troops. They include weapons delivery.

I want to be clear: They do not include the deployment of foreign soldiers to fight in Ukraine. It is envisioned that 32 nations will enter into bilateral security agreements with Ukraine. While they will vary to some extent, they will create a robust commitment of support for Ukraine. I would also add that these agreements—and specifically the United States’ bilateral agreement with Ukraine—include commitments by Ukraine to continue its consolidation of democratic governance and anti-corruption initiatives.

It is absolutely critical we send a clear message to Vladimir Putin that, no matter who is in the White House, the United States will stand by Ukraine in its fight to maintain its sovereignty.

Finally, this is not charity. It serves our national security interests. It is because future wars will be different from prior conflicts. They will now involve modern technology. Right now, Ukraine is experimenting with how to be effective in such a war, and Ukraine is adapting in realtime. With this bilateral agreement, Ukraine will be sharing information with the United States on everything they are learning on the battlefield. They will give our soldiers and military planners the ability to develop creative ways to use these new technologies.

This agreement strengthens our national security; it strengthens Ukraine; and it strengthens the resolve of allies looking to the United States for leadership on the global stage.

For all of these reasons, I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the insights offered by my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from the State of Maryland. I am grateful for his leadership in the Senate, for his friendship and all he does in looking out for the interests of our country, and I am grateful to have his insights today on the floor in explaining the reasons for his objection to the resolution that I have offered.

I would like to note that not one of these arguments negates the fundamental realities that we are dealing with here. Not one of them negates something very fundamental in all of this, which is the requirement in the Constitution, found in article II, section 2 of the Constitution, that says that the President “shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided [that] two-thirds of the Senators present concur.” That is a pretty significant requirement. So let’s address each of these arguments that we have heard in the last few minutes in turn.

We have heard arguments about the fact that there has been significant bipartisan support for Ukraine aid. That doesn’t negate this. I mean, first of all, providing material support—humanitarian or otherwise—to Ukraine is not the same as a treaty. A treaty creates a lasting international obligation, one that is intended specifically to outlast, as my friend from Maryland noted is the objective here, that is supposed to transcend one administration to the next, so it is not just a fleeting moment; it is an ongoing sovereign obligation.

For that very reason, article II, section 2 of the Constitution requires that the Senate ratify treaties before they may take effect. The President may

propose them. The President may negotiate them and even sign them, but unless or until a treaty is presented to the Senate and ratified in executive session by the Senate with a two-thirds supermajority vote—it takes 67 votes with 100 Senators—then you don't have a treaty, and you don't have that lasting, sovereign, international obligation—one that transcends one administration to another.

As far as the argument that there has been transparency and that there has been outreach by the White House to Senators and communication, that is great. It is the sort of thing that ought to happen. It is in no way sufficient to provide a substitute for or an end-run around article II, section 2 of the Constitution—requiring that treaties be presented to the Senate and ratified only with 67 votes in a 100 Member Chamber. So that doesn't do it. That can't take care of that here.

Look, the point here is that there is nothing in what I am suggesting that would necessarily close any doors in the future. What I am trying to say here is that, if we are going to do this—if we are going to close doors, as is the intention behind this agreement—close doors to future administrations and to future Congresses to bind us to some kind of a lasting obligation as a sovereign nation to one or more other sovereign nations internationally—then we have got to follow the treaty process because that is what the Constitution requires.

As to the idea that Ukraine is the frontline—the frontline of defending democracy as, I think, was one of the arguments raised here—our own obligation to protect our own sovereign borders and our own people, while at the same time containing and deterring other potential threats to the United States, such as those presented by China, have to come first. Those are the frontlines of our Republic—our own border, our own national defense, our own national security, the safety, the freedom, the security of our own people. That is the frontline that we are supposed to be focused on. That is literally our frontline, and insofar as that is incompatible with our efforts on another continent, those things have to be taken into account.

But there again, this is exactly the sort of thing that the Senate is supposed to consider not just in the abstract but in the context of a lasting, sovereign, international obligation in the context of treaty ratification proceedings, and that takes a two-thirds supermajority vote.

Executive agreements do not and constitutionally should not and cannot supersede laws passed by Congress. There is nothing in the Constitution that says that a lasting, sovereign, international obligation taken on by an Executive agreement made by the President of the United States alone, whether with or without consultation to one or more Members of Congress—there is nothing in there that says that

that satisfies the constitutional obligation.

Now, if the wording of article II, section 2 or any other provision of the Constitution reads otherwise, then we would be in a different circumstance, but alas, we are not in that universe. Quite fortunately, we are not. It is with good reason that the Founders put in there the two-thirds supermajority requirement, and we can't allow that simply to be bypassed here, not for light or casual purposes, not even for great purposes.

No matter how great our purposes are, no matter how noble one's intentions might be in the administration, in the Senate, or otherwise, one can't get around this simple fact that what we are talking about here is, for all practical purposes, a treaty, and we are being asked to treat it as such. That requires two-thirds. We don't have that here.

So no matter how much bipartisan support, no matter how much flowery rhetoric, no matter how much good that can be done, no matter how evil Vladimir Putin is, that still doesn't change our constitutional realities. We have each been sworn into office under circumstances where, pursuant to another provision of the Constitution, we are required to take an oath to the Constitution itself. Our oath requires nothing less than that we honor this and that we not pretend that we can just circumvent all of this simply by calling something an Executive agreement—no matter how justified by the circumstances we may want it to be.

Look, at the end of the day, we have to come to grapple with the fact that we are \$35 trillion in debt and that we face threats around the world, including and especially from China—China, which is gaining, increasingly, a foothold in our own hemisphere and in country after country throughout Latin America. China is gaining a physical presence, in addition to a more and more robust commercial arrangement, in addition to China's investment in so-called dual-use technologies, which in many circumstances have military purposes behind them. It is one of many policy reasons why we have got to be focused on China.

Insofar as we deplete our own resources in continuing to honor an obligation to another country in another hemisphere, we have got to take those things into account. It is one of many things that we have got to consider before taking on a treaty obligation. Make no mistake, this is a treaty obligation.

Abraham Lincoln is quoted as having asked the question rhetorically: If you count the tail of a dog as a leg, how many legs does the dog have?

People would, apparently, routinely—the uninitiated at least—respond by saying: Well, five legs.

And he would say: No. It is still four legs. Just because you call the tail of a dog a leg, it doesn't make it so.

Just because you call an Executive agreement a treaty and ask people to

treat it as if it were a treaty doesn't make it so.

I yield the floor.

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

COMMEMORATING THE PASSAGE OF 3 YEARS SINCE THE TRAGIC BUILDING COLLAPSE IN SURFSIDE, FLORIDA, ON JUNE 24, 2021

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 746.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 746) commemorating the passage of 3 years since the tragic building collapse in Surfside, Florida, on June 24, 2021.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 746) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 20, 2024, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

FEDERAL PRISON OVERSIGHT ACT

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3019.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3019) to establish an inspections regime for the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. OSSOFF. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 3019) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, how did it come to pass that in a nation whose founding document guarantees due