

change, but I hope Congress can act quickly to get Ukraine the military equipment it needs, as well as humanitarian support to help the millions of Ukrainians who have been displaced. We also need to make sure that our European partners are making similar contributions to help put President Zelenskyy in the strongest possible position to bring this war to an end. It would be a tragedy for Ukraine to have bought all this time with our help only to lose the initiative now.

So I hope that we can get this funding out the door as quickly as possible and that Democrats will not slow things down by attaching extraneous funding requests for unrelated policy riders. Thirty-three billion dollars is a substantial sum of money, but, as the news reports showing Ukrainian highways dotted with bombed-out Russian tanks attest, Ukraine is putting our military aid to good use.

The cost of inaction on our part—of allowing Vladimir Putin to destroy Ukraine and threaten NATO—would be much greater. We should not be so naive as to think that Putin's campaign of Soviet expansion will end with Ukraine. There are rightfully concerns that he will seek to escalate into former Soviet countries in Eastern Europe or even further. He has already hinted at a willingness to use nuclear weapons, and he proved in Syria that he is certainly OK with the use of chemical weapons.

I hope defenders of the Iran nuclear deal are making note of what nuclear power looks like in the hands of a nation with a malign agenda.

We cannot allow Putin to think that he can pursue his expansionist dreams unopposed.

The United States and all NATO members must remain committed to our shared defense and to supporting Ukraine in its fight for freedom. NATO countries should also preserve our open-door policy to nations that are seeking to contribute to the collective security of the alliance. There can never be too many allies in the quest to preserve peace and maintain a strong defense against tyranny, and we should welcome any nation that seeks to help further those goals.

Currently, Russia's main areas of control span from east of Kharkiv to previously contested parts of the Donbas and now along the coast of the Sea of Azov and past Crimea in an attempt to fully block Ukraine's access to the Black Sea. Russia has failed to capture Kyiv or break the resolve of the Ukrainian people, so now Putin wants to close Ukraine off from the world, which will harm not only Ukrainians but also Ukraine's trading partners that rely on Ukraine's substantial agricultural capacity.

Ukraine is a major exporter of wheat, corn, and sunflower oil. If Ukraine's ability to produce and export these products is compromised, which is already happening, we are likely to see not only price hikes but very serious food shortages as a result.

The World Food Programme reports that an additional 47 million people around the world could be facing acute hunger if the war in Ukraine continues. In a world in which hunger persists and famine looms, Putin's war of aggression in Ukraine threatens to cause casualties far beyond Ukraine's borders, which brings us back once again to the importance of supporting the Ukrainian people and their fight.

As President Zelenskyy said the other day in reference to the United States and Ukraine, we defend common values, democracy, and freedom. We do, indeed, Mr. President. We do, indeed.

The Ukrainian people are currently giving their all to secure a future of democracy and freedom in Ukraine. Let's continue to make it clear that they are not alone in that fight, and let's make sure they have the tools they need to win this war and secure Ukraine's freedom permanently.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

ROE V. WADE

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, my older daughter, Abigail—named for Abigail Adams, who urged her husband to “remember the ladies”—is 7. She is generous, silly, and so, so smart. She calls herself a maker-kid and dreams of being an engineer or an army nurse but definitely not a helicopter pilot.

My younger daughter, Maile, just turned 4. Her laugh is contagious, and early on during the pandemic when I was mostly working from home, she proved that she was truly her mother's daughter by starting to pull pranks, including grabbing my phone and, oopsies, hanging up on whoever was on the other line when I was trying to conduct a Zoom meeting or review some legislation instead of playing with her. But Abigail and Maile might not be here today if it weren't for the basic reproductive rights Americans have relied on for nearly 50 years.

When Roe was decided in 1973, it changed the lives of so many women.

It saved the lives of 14-year-olds who were the victims of rape or incest, who otherwise would have had to turn to back alleys and back rooms.

It changed the lives of women who desperately wanted to be moms but who found out their pregnancies weren't viable. They would have to go through the pain and suffering and trauma of a full term, only to stillborn at the end of 9 months.

Personally, for me, it gave me my chance to be a mom, for I never would have had my creative, silly, drive-me-crazy-yet-love-them-infinitely two daughters if Roe hadn't paved the way for women to make their own healthcare decisions, as I was only able to get pregnant through IVF, a fertility process that Roe lays the foundation for.

Because of IVF, I got to experience all the joys of motherhood. Because of reproductive rights, my husband and I

aren't just “Tammy and Bryan,” we are “Mommy and Daddy.”

Because of Roe and the rights and laws it protects, we are a family. Yet, last week, we learned that the Supreme Court could be just weeks away from overturning Roe v. Wade and Planned Parenthood v. Casey, a decision that, if made final, would strip away reproductive rights for millions of women, forcing them to potentially live through the horrors and indignities that their grandmothers bore if they needed reproductive care, and this would just be the start.

For while the anti-choice movement has been working for years—decades—to get to this moment, overturning Roe is not their end goal. They want a national ban on abortion, something the Republican Senate Leader said was a possibility just last week.

They want to undermine access to contraception. In some States, legislation has already been introduced that would make IVF a crime. In Oklahoma, one woman was even convicted of manslaughter for having a miscarriage—a miscarriage. Criminalized for having a miscarriage. I have had a miscarriage, and there are no words to describe what mothers feel in that moment. For me, I was overcome with the rawest, most painful emotion I had ever experienced.

In that moment, losing my baby felt more searing than anything I had ever felt in my entire life. Yet if the GOP has its way, women may now have to live in fear that that worst moment of their lives may also send them to prison. And if extremists get what they are seeking, doctors who perform procedures, such as dilation and curettage, to help grieving families who have lost a pregnancy might be at risk of going to jail too. Doctors like the one who after my own miscarriage conducted the D&C to clear out my uterus that allowed me to immediately continue my dream of having a baby via IVF, my desperately wished for second child, my beautiful rainbow baby, Maile.

So let's be honest, what is happening is not about protecting life. If the anti-choice movement truly wanted to protect life, they would stop trying to strip away Americans' healthcare. They would be putting all of their efforts into addressing the growing maternal mortality crisis that has taken a tragic number of Black mothers' lives.

They would be pushing for desperately needed policies that support parents, like affordable childcare and paid parental leave. If Republicans actually cared about being pro-life, they would do something, anything, to stand up to the National Rifle Association.

So, no, this isn't about saving lives. This isn't about looking out for families. It is about getting a slap on the back from their base and exerting even more control over women's bodies. It is about deepening divides between the haves and the have-nots. It is about

making it even harder to undo centuries of harm unleashed by systemic racism and economic injustice, systems under which women of color have suffered the most. Look, I know that a lot of us are tired from the seemingly endless fight to protect our most basic human rights, but we can do more. We have to do more. We must.

Congress itself has the power. We have the ability to vote tomorrow to pass the Women's Health Protection Act, which would codify *Roe v. Wade* once and for all because, let me be clear, women seeking care should not be ashamed. The people who should feel shame are those forcing these women to live through unnecessary pain and suffering. The people who should feel shame are those who claim to be pro-life, yet would let a mother die in childbirth for an unviable pregnancy, who refuse to expand Medicaid, who believe guns should be easy to get but basic healthcare impossible to find. These are the people who should be ashamed. These are the people who have no shame. And I will be damned if I let my daughters grow up in a country that gives them fewer rights than their mom had.

So here I am today fighting for tomorrow that doesn't look like our yesterday because in that yesterday, those of us with uteruses were treated as second-class citizens. And I didn't learn to fly Black Hawk helicopters, go to war for this Nation, nearly lose my life fighting for the rights enshrined in that Constitution I protected, only to come back home and have those same rights stripped away from the next generation of girls who simply want to be able to follow their own dreams, like I did mine.

To me, it comes down to this: Women should be allowed to make their healthcare decisions without MITCH MCCONNELL's voice or Brett Kavanaugh's face haunting them at their OB/GYN appointment. So shame on those who want to take us back to the pre-*Roe* back alleys. Shame on those who don't dare regulate guns but want to regulate our uteruses.

I will fight with everything I have got to keep us out of those back alleys because it is the least that the women who came before us and fought for these rights deserve, and it is the least that our own daughters need. So enough of the hypocrisy, enough of the misogyny, enough of some men in hallowed halls of DC arguing that they know better than women in Illinois or Arizona or Missouri. We can and we must do better. That means proving that we care about women every day of the year, not just on one Sunday in May. That means codifying *Roe* now. Let's vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator from Texas.

ABORTION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last several days, the radical left has taken the debate about abortion to dangerous ends.

Last week, a liberal group launched an intimidation campaign against six members of the Supreme Court. They posted a map online with their home addresses and encouraged protesters to take their complaints straight to the Justices' doorsteps. No surprise as swarms of protesters heeded their call. They showed up at some of the Justices' homes this weekend.

Even though this plan was in the works for several days, the White House remained silent and refused to condemn this clearcut example of doxing.

It wasn't until yesterday morning, once the weekend's protest had concluded, that the White House Press Secretary said the Justices should be able to do their jobs without fearing for their personal safety or the safety of their families. And that wasn't the only alarming update from the weekend.

A pro-life group in Wisconsin was vandalized and set on fire on Sunday morning. The person or persons responsible smashed windows and attempted to use a Molotov cocktail. They left graffiti on the exterior wall of the building that read, "If abortions aren't safe, then you aren't either."

Threats of violence are never acceptable. It doesn't matter who is making the threat or who is on the receiving end. There is a world of difference between legitimate public discourse protected under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and threats or acts of violence which are not.

Every single person in this Chamber, especially our Democratic colleagues, should affirm that any demonstrations about this heated issue cannot threaten the safety of anyone, Supreme Court Justices, pro-life advocates, or otherwise.

This past weekend's events have highlighted the need to better protect the Justices and their families. They deserve the protection that, at this moment, the Supreme Court Police are not able to provide. Last week, Senator COONS, the Senator from Delaware, and I introduced a bill to increase protection for all nine Justices and their families. This basically would be the same sort of authorities given to the Capitol Police in protecting Members of Congress.

The events of this weekend have underscored just how important this is. This legislation was at the request of the Chief Justice, who wants to ensure that members of the Court and their families have the security and protection they need, especially at this tense time when Justices are facing enhanced threats.

We currently have two Justices with school-age children, and in the coming months, that number will increase to three once Judge Jackson takes her place on the Supreme Court Bench. I am glad this bill passed the Senate last night, and I hope our colleagues in the House will take it up and pass it in the coming days.

This week, the issue at the center of this turmoil will be a topic of debate here in the U.S. Senate. The Democratic leader has promised that the Senate will vote on a radical abortion bill that goes far, far beyond codifying *Roe v. Wade*.

This radical pro-abortion bill that Senator SCHUMER has set for a vote on tomorrow allows for abortions at any point during a woman's pregnancy, up until the time of delivery.

It does this by prohibiting States from protecting an unborn child's right to life as long as one healthcare provider signs off that a pregnancy would pose a risk to the woman's physical or mental health.

It isn't hard to see that this is a blank check for abortion providers like Kermit Gosnell. You may remember that Dr. Gosnell was a physician in Philadelphia, PA, who ran something called the Women's Medical Society Clinic but which was dubbed a "house of horrors" during his subsequent trial.

He was also a prolific prescriber of OxyContin, but in 2011 Dr. Gosnell and his wife Pearl and eight employees were charged with a total of 32 felonies and 227 misdemeanors in connection with the deaths, illegal medical services, and regulatory violations at his abortion clinic.

Pearl and the eight employees pleaded guilty to various charges in 2011, while Dr. Gosnell pleaded not guilty and sought a jury trial. After that trial, Dr. Gosnell was convicted of first-degree murder in the deaths of three infants and involuntary manslaughter in the death of Karnamaya Mongar, an adult patient at the clinic following an abortion procedure.

Gosnell was also convicted of 21 felony counts of illegal late-term abortions and 211 counts of violating Pennsylvania's 24-hour informed consent law.

After his conviction, Gosnell waived his right to appeal, and in an exchange for an agreement from prosecutors not to seek the death penalty, he was sentenced to life in prison without parole.

Not only does the radical abortion bill that Senator SCHUMER has teed up a vote on tomorrow usurp the constitutional role reserved to the States, it would allow a child born after 21 weeks of gestation to be aborted. Next month, a baby who was born at 21 weeks and 2 days will celebrate his second birthday. But this extreme legislation would invalidate all State laws that limit abortions after 20 weeks of gestation.

This wouldn't just impact pro-life red States; this change is so radical that it would invalidate existing laws in blue States as well. In Massachusetts and Nevada, for example, abortions are restricted after 24 weeks. In California, Washington, and Illinois, abortions are restricted after viability.

If this legislation were to become law, those laws would be preempted under the supremacy clause of the Federal Constitution.

Now, this sort of radical lurch and knee-jerk reaction to a draft opinion