

are angry. And they are watching right now to see if we can just pass this simple resolution and do the very bare minimum of saying, with one voice, women have a right to get an abortion when their life is at stake—when their life is at stake.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 828 on the right to emergency healthcare, including abortion care; 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 Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. This resolution itself and the wording that it has in this resolution says it is the sense of the Senate that every person has the basic right to emergency healthcare, including abortion care.

Let me be very, very specific on this. We had a hearing today in the Finance Committee where this same subject was addressed. We had ob-gyns from both perspectives on this, those who perform abortions and those who have a moral objection to it. We had a very good argument to be able to lay some facts out to be able to walk through this, with two sets of attorneys there to be able to walk through the law.

Here is what became very clear during that conversation this morning in that open hearing. There is no State in America in which a woman faces persecution or prosecution for having an abortion. No State criminalizes miscarriage. No State criminalizes removing an ectopic pregnancy. No States prohibits lifesaving care for the mother. No State requires a woman to be actively dying in order for her doctor to care for her.

We heard story after story about doctors being concerned that they may face this because they are hearing political rhetoric—political rhetoric like Vice President HARRIS in a speech that she said recently—where she said women were being arrested and facing prosecution for experiencing miscarriages. That is not true.

So all of this rhetoric that is being put out there is making doctors afraid, but it was very clear from the conversation in law that none of those things are actually true. Every physician prior to the Dobbs decision—when there were limitations on abortion across the country and post-Dobbs decision, when every single State is making those decisions—allowed physicians in an ER to be able to make lifesaving decisions for the mother and the child. Every doctor has already the ability to be able to make that decision to be able to protect the life of the mother. They have the protections to be able to do that.

So this is a false claim that somehow what happened in the Dobbs decision

and what is happening in the States is limiting that. It is actually the political rhetoric that is making people afraid.

What also came out during the hearing this morning was the very real risk of chemical abortions. We have recently had tragic situations where women used the chemical abortion pills that they are being told are as safe as Tylenol, and that it has life-threatening and in some cases, recently, life-taking consequences. Chemical abortion pills are not Tylenol, yet they are being sold as that.

And what we are seeing is more and more cases of the diminishing of “this is no big deal to be able to end this pregnancy” when they haven’t seen a doctor because the Biden administration is now saying you don’t have to see a physician. So the woman doesn’t know if she has an ectopic pregnancy or not. If she takes the chemical abortion pill while she has an ectopic pregnancy, she is at risk. But the Biden administration is saying: You don’t have to see a doctor. They can just mail it to you. It is just as safe as Tylenol when it is not.

We are also not being tested for their blood type to be able to make sure it doesn’t affect future pregnancies during this chemical abortion. And they are not also determining by sonogram how far along the mom is in this process because there are limitations to this where it becomes more and more dangerous.

All those things are restrictions that used to be there, that the Biden administration has taken away to say: No, we want more people to have access to chemical abortions. But it is making it more dangerous for women. And we have seen this recently.

So we want to engage in a conversation about how can we actually put some of those basic humane doctor-requested restrictions in there to make sure we are protecting the lives of all those women. That is a better conversation for us to be able to have. To say: What is it the FDA actually said was appropriate in the past, and what can we do to be able to protect the lives of women?

So, yes, I object to this resolution based on the wording and what we are doing. But, yes, we should be able to continue to have this conversation because there is a real concern that more and more doctors are afraid to do basic healthcare in an ER because more and more people are laying rhetoric out there that they are going to be arrested, and that is not true.

There has not been a single physician in the country that has been arrested based on actually performing lifesaving care for mom in any ER room in the country.

With that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I disagree with the Senator from Okla-

homa, and let me be perfectly clear about what is happening. Here in America, in the 21st century, pregnant women are suffering and dying, not because doctors don’t know how to save them, but because doctors don’t know if Republicans will let them.

There are skyrocketing maternal death rates in States like Texas, and as I spoke out on the floor last week, there are at least two women dead in Georgia today because of Republican abortion bans. Those kids are now growing up without a mother. That is the harsh reality.

Republicans can’t ignore that. Donald Trump can’t shout over it. The American people will not ever forget it. And every day we are going to continue to hold those people who are opposed to this accountable for the cruelty of these abortion bans.

The fact is that the resolution that I offered simply says that doctors can provide emergency care for the life of a mother. I don’t understand where the disagreement is, and I hope that we can pass this and give doctors and women the confidence that, in the United States of America, when you are pregnant and having a severe emergency medical situation, you will be treated. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2152

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support a woman’s right to control her own body. Across the country, women have been stripped of the freedom to make their own decisions—decisions about their families, their health, and their futures. Judges and politicians have inserted themselves into exam rooms, telling doctors they cannot treat their patients, sometimes even if that treatment would save her life.

In my home State of Wisconsin, women lived for 15 months under a criminal abortion ban that was passed in 1849, a law on the books from 1 year after our statehood and 70 years before a woman won the right to vote. And while there were no women in the room when the statute was crafted, 2 years ago, Wisconsin women woke up to find their healthcare decisions would be dictated by a law that predates the Civil War. They woke up to find out that they now had fewer rights than their mothers and their grandmothers. That day began 15 months of confusion and chaos and heartbreak for families across Wisconsin.

We heard stories of women bleeding out from miscarriages, developing life-threatening infections, or being forced to carry unviable pregnancies until they could find an appointment out of State. For countless women, that meant driving hours, paying for lodging and childcare, and taking time off work just to make their own decisions about their own body.

Patients from every one of Wisconsin’s 72 counties traveled to Illinois just to access healthcare, some traveling over 500 miles. Prior to the Dobbs

decision, only one in six Wisconsin abortion patients received out-of-State care. During our criminal abortion ban, that number skyrocketed to 9 out of 10 patients seeking care out of State.

Those families were being forced to drive, on average, 103 minutes to exercise their right to control their own bodies and get the care they needed, nearly double the time that they drove to access care before Roe fell.

And I am talking here about women who could afford the more than \$1,000 in costs to access that care. We must also be aware of those who could not. For example, patients traveling from out of State had to fork up an average of \$330 just for lodging.

In 2023 alone, Illinois and Minnesota providers saw over 6,000 patients from Wisconsin. You heard me right. Six thousand Wisconsin women were forced to travel sometimes hundreds of miles just to access healthcare. And even though Wisconsin has restored access to abortion in three counties, Planned Parenthood of Illinois is still seeing three times as many patients from Wisconsin compared to before the Dobbs decision came down. The reality is that abortion care is still only available in 3 of our 72 counties.

Exercising this fundamental freedom is out of reach for far too many in America. Twenty-two States across the country have abortion bans, and that means one in three women of reproductive age live in a State where they cannot get the healthcare they need because politicians are telling them that they know better.

Well, women and families deserve better. That is why last year I introduced the Reproductive Health Travel Fund Act to give millions of women without access to care in their home States a lifeline. This bill would ease the tremendous financial burden Republican abortion bans have placed squarely on women who are trying to access critical care. Women are spending hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars to pay for travel, lodging, meals, and childcare just to make their own healthcare decisions.

These past 2 years we have heard shocking stories of women, often desperate for help, having nowhere to turn. Last week, we even heard the story of a woman who died because she was denied abortion care until it was too late.

If my colleagues insist that this issue is a decision for the States and not for women, then I hope that they can at least recognize the tremendous hardship their patchwork of laws has created.

The rights you have as an American should not depend upon what State you live in. If we cannot restore Roe this Congress, we should, at the very least, extend a lifeline to the millions of women who are unable to access care in their own communities.

So as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor,

and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 2152, the Reproductive Health Travel Fund Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if my Democrat colleagues were honest, they would call this bill what it really is: the "Elective Abortion Travel Slush Fund for All Act." This bill authorizes 350 million taxpayer dollars for radical abortion groups to facilitate elective abortions.

And this money isn't limited to Americans. It would also give taxpayer money to noncitizens—illegal aliens—who are seeking abortions. This bill would use Federal funds to cover the cost of flights, food, hotels, and other expenses for any individual in the United States seeking abortion, paid for by the American taxpayers. It would even cover lost wages for those traveling to get abortion.

Fifty million dollars of taxpayer money in this bill would go directly to groups like Planned Parenthood to pay for advertising, website development, increasing staff, and building maintenance and construction, all of which will go to encouraging—if not coercing—women to get abortions, not to seek alternatives.

Now, there is a major inconvenient fact that Senate Democrats are ignoring: The Hyde amendment is clear, no taxpayer funds may be used for abortion. My colleagues will say: Well, no, this money isn't paying for abortions. But let's be clear. This taxpayer money is being used for one purpose: to take the lives of unborn children.

While the actual abortion procedures aren't covered by this bill, it covers every other cost associated with ensuring abortions happen.

Democrats know the Hyde amendment prevents and prohibits Federal dollars funding abortions. It has been the law of the land for 48 years. It was democratically agreed to then, and it still stands today. Still, today, 60 percent of voters agree with the Hyde amendment—on both sides of the aisle—that taxpayer dollars should not be used for abortions. I am sure that percentage is even higher for illegals getting taxpayer money for abortions.

But Democrats really don't care. Despite what they say, they will override American voters if democracy gets in the way of their latest leftwing pet project.

Democrats know States have democratically decided what their laws on abortions are. Now they are trying to override the will of the people and the will of the States by using the Federal Government and millions of taxpayer dollars to achieve their goal. This is

not only counter to the spirit of the Hyde amendment, it is contrary to the principles of federalism and the will of the American people.

As I pointed out for months last year with a similar illegal abortion policy Secretary Lloyd Austin implemented at the Department of Defense, no Agency—no Agency—is above the law. I called out the VA for implementing another illegal abortion policy.

This bill is just another page—another page—out of the Democrats' same extreme abortion playbook. This bill is a flimsy attempt to go around the law of the land.

Gone are the days of the Democrats saying abortions should be safe, legal, and rare. Democrats today want dangerous, illegal, and limitless abortions at any cost—any cost—to the American taxpayers.

So for that reason, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am disappointed with the objection and will agree with the Senator on one point, which is that this bill does not fund abortion.

The Senator referred to democratically passed laws relating to this subject, and I just wanted to remind him once more what I said in my opening statement: In Wisconsin, women lived for 15 months under a criminal abortion ban that was passed in 1849—70 years before women had the right to vote, before the Civil War. Obviously women had no input in that democratically enacted law.

But this bill simply breaks down a barrier that Americans are facing to access sometimes lifesaving care, a financial barrier, I might add, that Republicans put up when they inserted themselves into our exam rooms and into women's personal decisions.

I hope my Republican colleagues understand that women take notice when you vote down bills that protect and defend their basic freedoms. They see who is fighting for their right to control their bodies, health, families, and future.

I am proud to be standing here today on their behalf. This issue is not going away. We are going to keep fighting day in and day out because women want their rights and freedoms back.

Some of my colleagues are claiming that this is merely a messaging bill. Well, send Americans the message that you support their decisions to make their own healthcare choices and pass this bill into law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

ENHANCED PRESIDENTIAL SECURITY ACT OF 2024

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, last week, in both the House and the Senate, legislation was introduced to