

much fiction. HB2 has very little to do with women's health. It is a thinly veiled scheme to block women's health choices with unjustifiable requirements for abortion clinics. The AMA and the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists—people who obviously have expertise on this issue—have said very clearly in a legal brief, an amicus brief, that the restrictions are “contrary to accepted medical practice and are not based on scientific evidence.” Despite the advice of the American Medical Association and the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Texas went ahead with the law anyway. If it stands, the number of clinics that provide abortion care will drop by more than three-quarters. Now HB2 backers say it is about preventing complications from abortion. Yet they ignore other procedures—colonoscopies, for example, that have much higher rates of complications. HB2 backers say women who live where these clinics have shuttered could go to other States, but the fact is, we are hearing that really isn't an option for so many women.

Louisiana just passed its own version of HB2. Just yesterday the news came down that legislators in Florida have passed a similar measure. The Florida bill goes one dangerous step further by going after funding for Planned Parenthood. Attacks on Planned Parenthood aren't anything new, not in statehouses like Tallahassee or here in the Congress. When you threaten Planned Parenthood in this way, you are going far beyond restricting access to abortion. Here is the list of vital women's health care services which have absolutely nothing to do with abortion, and these services which have nothing to do with abortion are under threat: pregnancy testing, birth control, prenatal services, HIV testing, cancer screenings, vaccinations, testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, basic physical exams, treatment for chronic conditions, pediatric care, hospital and specialist referrals, adoption referrals, nutrition programs.

The fact is, this assault on women's health care is going to hit disadvantaged, struggling women hard across our country. There are countless women across America enrolled in Medicaid who rely on Planned Parenthood and similar programs for their basic, essential medical care. It is their first line of defense for basic health care, particularly in rural communities in rural Oregon. The women know and trust their doctors at those clinics. Without those clinics, they aren't going to have anywhere to turn for their care. If you are working an hourly job, you have kids to care for on your own, it is pretty clear you are not going to find an easy way to take a day off work and travel far away for medical care. Yet these are the kind of laws that are being passed in States across America. These anti-woman laws are unfair and they are dangerous.

This will not be the last time I come to the floor to discuss this. My view is

access to health care for women in this country is in trouble, and a number of the services I have talked about are essentially part of what is a constitutional right—a constitutional right. It doesn't just mean it is a constitutional right if you are well-off. It is a constitutional right because the U.S. Supreme Court has said it, and I intend to defend that constitutional right. I intend to do everything I can to build bipartisan support so that instead of women's health services being in deep trouble as I described today, women can know that those essential services are available for them across the country.

Mr. President, 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.

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

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

#### STUDENT'S FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about one of our most cherished rights as U.S. citizens; that is, the freedom of speech and why allowing our children and young people to exercise this right at a young age is critical to learning and understanding complex and tough issues and ideas.

The ability to effectively teach and learn journalism—and for other students to be challenged to engage in public discourse on tough issues—was severely hindered by the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in 1988 in *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier*. The *Hazelwood* case legitimized a school's decision to remove material about divorce and teen pregnancy from the pages of a student newspaper on the grounds that the material was overly mature for a high school audience.

Justice William Brennan, one of the First Amendment's greatest judicial champions, dissented from that ruling in words that resonate with us here today. He said: “Instead of teaching children to respect the diversity of ideas that is fundamental to the American system and that our Constitution is a living reality, not parchment preserved under glass, the Court today teaches youth to discount important principles of our government as mere platitudes.”

History has vindicated Justice Brennan's dire warning. Students regularly report that they have been prevented from discussing matters of public importance in the pages of student media or, perhaps worse, they have restrained themselves from even attempting to address an issue of social or political concern in fear of adverse consequences. That is not an environment that values and empowers student

voices, and it is not a climate conducive to the effective learning of civic participation. We can and must do better.

On the 25th anniversary of the *Hazelwood* decision in 2013, every major journalism education organization in the Nation enacted a resolution calling on schools and colleges to abandon reliance on the *Hazelwood* level of institutional control. The sentiment was perhaps best expressed by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, the largest organization in the country of college journalism instructors, which stated that “no legitimate . . . purpose is served by the censorship of student journalism even if it reflects unflatteringly on school policies and programs, candidly discusses sensitive social and political issues, or voices opinions challenging to majority views on a matter of public concern.”

Since then, nine States have statutes protecting the independence of student journalists to report on issues of public concern without fear, and two have comparable protections by way of the State board of education rules. The combined experience of these 11 States spans well over 160 years, demonstrating that young people are fully capable of exercising a measure of legally protected press freedom responsibly and without incident or harm.

I am proud to say that my own home State of North Dakota established a position of national leadership by enacting the John Wall New Voices of North Dakota Act in 2015. The statute was named in memory of a truly amazing educator, John Wall, who lived his own civics lesson by running for the North Dakota House of Representatives, where he served with great distinction for 10 years after retiring from a 34-year career as a public school teacher.

The New Voices Act passed the North Dakota State Legislature with bipartisan sponsorship and without a single negative vote. That is truly an amazing fact. As we think about the importance of student journalism, the importance of voicing opinions and the importance of learning the value of participation through the First Amendment or through speech, I am often reminded of a personal incident that I had in my family.

My daughter was not on the school newspaper when she was in high school, but she frequently wrote a column. One column that she wrote generated a lot of controversy in a very small town at a time when it was much more controversial. It was an article that promoted marriage equality. She ended up getting a lot of grief and a lot of negative attention as a result of writing that article. My daughter is pretty opinionated. So it didn't bother her too much.

But many years later, I received a letter from a mother. That letter from a mother talked about how she was in a same-sex relationship, had been most

of her life and most of her daughter's life, and how once my daughter had published this article in the Mandan school newspaper, it changed the outcome. It changed the way her daughter went to school every day because she knew she wasn't alone. She knew someone was there in that school who understood her challenges and supported her family. So where it may not move big issues—and it may not be a big, moving example like Hazelwood—it can, in fact, change outcomes. The ability to express yourself, the ability to be part of a community where we have open ideas is absolutely instrumental and critical to the future of our country.

When you look at the restrictions that still today are put on student press and student newspapers, we know we have to do better.

I applaud the new voices of North Dakota organization and its founder, Professor Steven Listopad of Valley City State University and those teachers, professors, and students around the country who engage in similar efforts for helping shine the Nation's attention on the urgent need to protect meaningful and candid journalism so that young people have an opportunity to participate and drive the civic dialogue about the world in which they live and they will eventually lead.

The skills learned and developed by student journalists and the roles they can play in driving public conversation among their peers speak to the indispensable role that journalism can play—if adequately supported by our schools—in educating the next generation for the careers of the future and for preparing our children to discuss, debate, and lead on important and controversial issues.

I think that, as we are moving forward and taking a look at what can be done, it is important that we all appreciate that the First Amendment is not something that you should just learn in school books. It is something that you must exercise. And the sooner you exercise that First Amendment right to speech, the sooner we recognize that young voices in this country are as critical as older voices and no student should be restricted or prevented from expressing an opinion and the stronger we will grow in our democracy.

I look forward to continuing to work on this issue. I look forward to taking on the difficult task of talking about what we can do nationally to advance this, but I mainly came to the floor to applaud the great State of North Dakota for recognizing the importance of students' First Amendment rights.

I encourage all Members in this Chamber to examine what happens at home with students' First Amendment rights, to provide leadership, to promote those rights in their State, and to potentially look at how we can reverse the Hazelwood decision so that we can grow a more confident, a more educated, and a more diverse population for our future.

With that, 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. SASSE. 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 DOCTOR QUENTIN YOUNG

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about an extraordinary person who passed away on Monday, March 7, at the age of 92. Dr. Quentin Young was a dedicated physician and an advocate for civil rights in Chicago.

Some of Dr. Quentin's patients included the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., the Beatles, Studs Terkel, the late Mayor Harold Washington, and even President Obama.

Dr. Young's commitment to the common good is what makes him a legend. He spent 35 years at Cook County Hospital and 56 years of private practice in Hyde Park improving health care while fighting for social justice and racial equality. His autobiography is titled, "Everybody In, Nobody Out: Memoirs of a Rebel Without a Pause." And he meant it.

Doctor Quentin Young grew up in Hyde Park in Chicago's Southside. And when America entered World War II, he enlisted in the Army and served his country honorably.

After returning from the war, Dr. Young graduated from medical school at Northwestern University and would go on to spend 35 years at Cook County Hospital treating patients and becoming a moral voice during the Civil Rights era. When people outside of Chicago hear the words Cook County and hospital, people think about the show "ER" and doctors resembling George Clooney. For the people in Chicago, they think of Dr. Quentin Young.

Dr. Young's experience at Cook County Hospital and his efforts during the Civil Rights movement were intertwined. In 1951, he was a founder of the Committee to End Discrimination in Chicago Medical Institutions, which focused on ending racist practices in Chicago's hospitals and clinics.

By 1960, the Cook County Hospital was serving the Black community and immigrant Mexican community almost exclusively. Eighty percent of Chicago's Black births and nearly half of all Black deaths were at Cook County Hospital. This place was one of the frontlines of social inequality and Dr. Young and his family fought to change that. His efforts were not limited to the Chicagoland area. Dr. Young was a founder and national chairman of the Medical Committee for Human Rights or MCHR, which formed in June 1964 to offer support and medical care for civil rights workers, community activists,

and summer volunteers working in Mississippi during the Freedom Summer.

It was the MCHR that provided help and emergency medical care to anti-war protesters at the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. In October of that year, Dr. Young received a summons by the House Un-American Activities Committee for his involvement in MCHR. He valiantly defended the MCHR's work.

After Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., was struck in the head by a rock while marching through a White neighborhood, Dr. Young was there to patch him up. He was not only Dr. King's physician but a fellow marcher during the Marquette Park protest in 1966.

Dr. Young and the late Dr. Jorge Prieto, former head of the Chicago Board of Health, became the primary force behind the movement to found neighborhood medical clinics in the late 1960s. These clinics gave medical help to countless people when they couldn't afford to go to the doctor.

From 1972 to 1981, he served as chairman of Medicine at Cook County Hospital. His example helped bring many dedicated people back to the hospital, but it wasn't without challenges. The staff went on strike because of the lack of resources in 1975. Dr. Young sided with the young doctors, and the governing commission fired him for it. With loyalty, the striking staff took his office door off its hinges so management couldn't change the locks and held a 24-hour vigil outside his office until he regained his position after a court fight.

In 1980, Dr. Young founded the Chicago-based and Illinois-focused Health & Medicine Policy Research Group, which conducts research, education, policy development, and advocacy for policies that impact health systems to improve the health status of all people. He would go on to serve as Mayor Harold Washington's appointment as president to the Chicago Board of Health.

Dr. Quentin Young never lost his passion for providing equal access to health care for the people of Illinois. Since retiring from private practice in 2008, he fought hard for a single-payer system.

In 2001, at the age of 78, he walked 167 miles across Illinois, from Mississippi River to Lake Michigan, with former Governor Pat Quinn to promote access to health care.

He never wavered in his belief in humanity's ability and responsibility to make a more equal and just nation. My prayers and thoughts go out to his family, Michael, Ethan, Nancy, Polly, Barbara, William, Karen, and his nine grandchildren.

#### COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, 8 years ago, I convened the first in a series of hearings in Vermont where the Senate Judiciary Committee examined