

will have the opportunity to do just that on the floor today when we cast our votes on the Women's Health Protection Act. These protections are desperately needed, and it is our responsibility to take action so that this fundamental right remains real for the women and the men who stand with them across this country.

Freedom and equality under the law, for the first time in generations—and I want young people out there to think about this—we may live in a world where women have fewer rights than their moms or their grandmas. That is not the world we want.

I urge my colleagues to stand up with the majority of Americans who support a woman's right to make her own healthcare decision, the freedom to make her decision, by enshrining the protections of *Roe v. Wade* into law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have never seen so much furor over a case that has not been decided, based on a leaked draft dated February of this year which does not reflect a final decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, this egregious leak of this draft opinion has created serious security threats for members of the Supreme Court and their families. Over the last few days, angry protesters have shown up at three of the Justices' private family homes. Sadly, the majority leader of the Senate said he is OK with peaceful protest outside the Justices' homes.

I disagree, and so does his second in command. This morning, Senator DURBIN called this practice "reprehensible."

The threats to Justices remain high because emotions are high, and the Chief Justice has asked Congress take action to protect the Justices and their families by simply providing the same sort of authorities that the Capitol Police have to provide protection to Members of Congress and our families.

Last week, I introduced legislation that would do that. I asked my friend and frequent collaborator, Senator COONS, if he would be interested in co-sponsoring the bill to make it bipartisan.

Initially, he raised concerns with one of the provisions, but we worked in good faith to address his concerns and introduced a new version of the bill that could gain broad bipartisan support.

And, clearly, we were successful because our bill passed the Senate unanimously on Monday, and now it is time for our colleagues in the House to follow suit.

Yesterday, Congressman ISSA and Congressman CORREA introduced this bipartisan bill in the House, and Speaker PELOSI should act quickly to bring this bill up for a vote as soon as possible.

Unfortunately, some in the House disagree. They have chosen to ignore

the bipartisan bill that received unanimous support in the Senate and have introduced a partisan version, which is guaranteed to slow down the protections needed by the Supreme Court Justices and their families.

This partisan bill in the House ignores the good-faith work that was being done here in the Senate to build consensus and expands this legislation to include divisive provisions, like potentially extending police protection to the very person who leaked the draft opinion.

Well, this stands no chance of becoming law.

At the end of the day, here is where we are: The Supreme Court Justices and their families are facing serious security threats, and the Senate unanimously passed a bill to provide them with the protection that they need and they deserve. I can't think of any good reason why House Democrats would delay a vote on this bipartisan bill, or, worse, allow the safety of the Justices' families to become a political football.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. President, on another matter, later today, the Senate will vote on a radical abortion-on-demand bill, which our Democratic colleagues are trying to sell as a codification of *Roe v. Wade*.

But the truth of the matter is, this bill sweeps aside all of the protections, for example, for conscience, for religious liberty, for opposing taxpayer funding of abortions, and partial birth abortions. It sweeps all that aside and essentially makes abortion available on demand from the time of conception until the time of delivery.

Now, this isn't the first time our friends across the aisle have tried to opportunistically capitalize on events to check items off of their liberal wish list. In fact, we have witnessed this strategy numerous times.

When the pandemic first hit, the House Democratic whip referred to the crisis as a "tremendous opportunity to restructure things to fit [their] vision." And to their credit, our Democratic colleagues certainly didn't squander that opportunity.

Last year, they crafted a nearly \$2 trillion spending bill that included most of the far left's outbox, their biggest priorities, and they tried to brand it as necessary pandemic relief, which it was not. Backdoor funding for Planned Parenthood, a blank check for mismanaged union pension funds, money for climate justice—it was easy to see through this COVID relief facade because, in the end, less than 10 percent of the money was directly related to the pandemic, and less than 1 percent supported vaccination efforts.

We saw the same play when it came to election law. States across the country established temporary measures during the pandemic to ensure that voters could cast a ballot during some of the most worrisome days of the pandemic.

When those temporary procedures were rolled back to what they were be-

fore the pandemic, our colleagues tried to frame that as voter suppression. They resurrected a bill that would force a one-size-fits-all election formula out of Washington, DC, on every State and community in the country and, in the process, hand Democrats a permanent governing majority.

And Democrats tried to cast anyone who opposed their partisan bill as attacking the sacred right to vote, which it was not.

But here we are seeing the same play once again. Our colleagues are now trying to seize on the political firestorm from a stolen Supreme Court draft opinion to push their radical abortion agenda. And no doubt about it, it is truly extreme.

Just as they did with their pandemic spending spree and election takeover bill, Democrats have taken things to the very nth degree, and they are pushing for a bill that is far out of line with the views of most Americans over this divisive and emotional topic.

Only 19 percent of Americans say that abortion should be available in all cases, with no exceptions—19 percent. That means 81 percent disagree.

Even though the vast majority of Americans oppose unrestricted abortion access, that is exactly what this bill would provide. This bill would allow for abortions at any stage of a pregnancy. All it takes is one healthcare provider who says having the baby would present a potential harm to the mother's health, including her mental health.

And I mentioned yesterday the case of Kermit Gosnell, who ultimately was serving life in prison for running an abortion factory involving late-term abortions and other illegal abortions performed in Pennsylvania.

So where is the line here? Where is the line?

Democrats see no line. They don't credit an unborn child with its very humanity or else they would see some sort of balancing against the mother's right to physical autonomy and the child's right to life guaranteed in our Declaration of Independence.

Is anxiety about motherhood a strong enough diagnosis to allow a woman who is 39 weeks pregnant to abort her baby in a late-term abortion? Anxiety can be a serious struggle that many prospective mothers face. There is no question about that. That is why I have been advocating for better access to mental healthcare services for all Americans, including expecting and new moms.

But this legislation is written so broadly that in practice, it legalizes abortion for virtually any reason up until the time the baby is actually delivered.

Now, the American people aren't the only ones who oppose unlimited abortion on demand. This bill doesn't just codify *Roe v. Wade*; it goes far beyond the abortion policies among other countries, like those in Europe, for example.

In most European countries, abortion access is restricted after a certain point in the pregnancy—in Sweden, it is 18 weeks of pregnancy; in France, it is 14 weeks; in Germany, it is 12 weeks; in Portugal, 10 weeks. Each of these limits are more restrictive than the current law in a number of American States, including blue States like Massachusetts and Nevada, where abortions are restricted after 24 weeks. In California, Washington, and Illinois, abortions are restricted after viability, an arbitrary line, roughly, 20 weeks of gestation—20 to 23 weeks of gestation.

But under this extreme bill, one healthcare provider could stop an otherwise constitutional State law protecting the life of this unborn child in its tracks.

Even though most Americans oppose late-term abortions, our Democratic colleagues are running full speed ahead in order to permit it under this extreme bill. They are so desperate to make abortion-on-demand the law of the land that this legislation has the support of all but a handful of Democrats in Congress.

As the Republican Senate leader pointed out earlier this week, 97 percent of Washington Democrats are pushing for policies that only 19 percent of Americans support. This is proof, once again, that today's Democratic Party is simply not listening to the American people; it is taking its marching orders from the most radical—most radical—and extreme members of their own political party.

Our colleagues are trying to frame this legislation as codifying *Roe v. Wade*, a 1973 opinion 50 years ago. But in reality, this radical bill goes much, much further. It doesn't just maintain the status quo; it moves abortion policies in the direction of those in the People's Republic of China and North Korea and away from those of our friends and allies in Europe.

I would think that is not company we would feel comfortable keeping, with the People's Republic of China, run by the Chinese Communist Party, and North Korea, the home of Kim Jong Un.

In addition to allowing abortions up to the time of delivery, this bill allows abortions to be used as a method of sex selection, a shameful practice that became common in China under its one-child policy.

A number of States have laws on the book that prevent someone from having an abortion based on the baby's sex. In other words, the parent who is hoping for a son cannot just have an abortion because the baby is a girl. But this bill would change that. It would invalidate State laws that prevent sex-selective abortions.

This bill would make further changes that endanger the very women who are receiving abortions. For example, it rolls back a commonsense provision including requirements that only a licensed physician can perform or prescribe an abortion. It removes guide-

lines for how abortion facilities are regulated and maintained, and it removes commonsense safeguards like consent laws and waiting periods.

Along with all of these radical and extreme changes, this legislation comes with no guarantees that taxpayers won't be asked to foot the bill for these elective procedures, and it provides no protection for babies who survive a botched abortion.

It puts healthcare providers with religious or moral opposition to abortion in an impossible position. They have to disregard their sincerely held religious or moral beliefs or they get sued.

This isn't the Woman's Health Protection Act; it is the "Abortion on Demand Act," without restrictions, without limitations.

It promotes abortion at a scale far beyond *Roe v. Wade* and far beyond what the vast majority of the American people are comfortable with.

So this is not a serious effort to codify *Roe*, and it certainly isn't an attempt to reinstate policies that are in line with most Americans' view on this very emotional and divisive issue. What this is, is pandering to the most radical elements in their party.

The good news is that Democrats still don't have the votes to pass this bill. Given the opposition of the vast majority of Americans, I doubt they ever will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is a debate about the Women's Health Protection Act—protecting women's health, protecting half of America's population in their right to seek the healthcare they require, protecting their ability, half of America, to make decisions about their own bodies. How is this a question even up for debate?

Today, the Senate considers the Women's Health Protection Act. A woman's right to make choices about her own body is a constitutional right. It was affirmed by the Supreme Court nearly 50 years ago. Polling—as if that should be the benchmark by which we legislate—shows that nearly two out of three Americans believe the fundamental right established in 1973's *Roe v. Wade* should be upheld. Yet here we are today—a body of 100, 76 percent of which are male—making decisions about the private lives of the nearly 168 million women in this country. That is ludicrous.

The right of any woman to receive the healthcare they choose and seek should be important to each and every one of us. Women—our mothers, daughters, sisters, aunts, friends—they know what is best for them in their own lives. How patronizing to suggest otherwise. How patriarchal. How insulting. How dangerous.

I am the dean of the Senate; I am the longest serving Member of this body today. I have worked for decades to support legislation that affirms a woman's right to access comprehensive

healthcare from a trusted provider without interference. The right to comprehensive family planning resources—whatever those resources may be—is not only a fundamental right to privacy for these women, but it is an important public health policy as well.

In 2019, the Vermont House and Senate, by wide margins, approved the Freedom of Choice Act, which guarantees the right to access safe abortion care in Vermont. Governor Scott—a Republican—signed that bill into law in June 2019. If the Court does overturn *Roe*, the Freedom of Choice Act would protect this healthcare right in Vermont, just as the Supreme Court case that was ahead of *Roe v. Wade*, *Beecher v. Leahy*, does the same. Once again, Vermont is a leader on an issue of national significance.

The unfortunate reality is that 26 other States stand ready to ban abortion rights in the absence of *Roe*. What are the women of these States to do? And prominent Republican voices in the Senate even now say they would not rule out the possibility that a future Senate and Congress would overrule such State laws in Vermont and elsewhere and impose a national ban on women's choice.

And what laws are these States prepared to pass—what resources are they prepared to provide—to support these women and the children they will bear? The answer we know, and I fear, is none. States will determine what you do, but they won't do anything to help you afterwards.

The implications of the Supreme Court's opinion, should a final decision mirror the leaked draft, go far beyond reproductive rights. For decades, the Supreme Court has stood as an independent arbiter in this country. Striking down a constitutional right that has supported millions of Americans, not just women, will cause many to lose confidence in the integrity of our judicial system. Worse still, it could threaten the rights protected under the precedent set by *Roe* and affirmed in other cases. I acknowledge the fear that many are feeling right now about that possibility. Certainly, I hear it in my office. And that is why we need to pass the Women's Health Protection Act.

What would the suffragists say of us today? What would the icons of the civil rights movement say of us today? A vote against the Women's Health Protection Act is a vote against equality. It is a vote against women, plain and simple. It is a vote against the progress we have made to right the wrongs of inequality. And it is at odds with what an overwhelming majority of the American public believes. It says, in many States in this country, women will be treated differently than men.

You know, my sons and grandsons can travel anywhere in the United States knowing the law is the same for them. My daughter and granddaughters, under this, would know they

could not be treated the same as they travelled around the country. What does that say about America, that our sons and our grandsons will be treated differently than our daughters and our granddaughters? Our daughters and our granddaughters will be told by some States: You have less rights than your brothers or your fathers or your uncles.

Shame on this Senate today. I stand with women—my wife, my daughter, my granddaughters—when I say that I trust them to make the health decisions that are best for them. And I will fight against any effort to erode those fundamental, constitutional rights. That is what the Senate should do; that is what we should do if we truly are going to be the conscience of the Nation. That is what this Vermonter intends to do.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, last week, we learned that the United States Supreme Court is preparing to issue a ruling that would fundamentally roll back the constitutional rights of millions of American women. It has been reported that a group of anti-choice Justices on the Supreme Court are planning to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, the landmark case decided nearly 50 years ago which recognized the reproductive rights of women.

This decision centered on one of the most fundamental rights we have as Americans—the right to control our own bodies. For nearly half a century *Roe* has protected a woman's right to make extremely personal decisions about her own body, her own healthcare, her own family. But now—now we are seeing a clear, coordinated attempt by anti-choice politicians to roll back the clock on the rights of American women, control what happens to their bodies, and strike down reproductive freedom.

If the Supreme Court moves forward with this action, it will have immediate—immediate and devastating—consequences for women's health.

So let's get something straight: overturning *Roe* isn't going to stop abortions. It is only going to stop women from getting safe abortions, and women will die as a result. This will also have a severe impact on how miscarriages and other life-threatening medical issues related to pregnancy are handled.

For example, if *Roe* is overturned, ectopic pregnancies could become a death sentence for women in States that ban abortions. This is just one example of the harm this will cause.

This will disproportionately impact women who lack the resources to go to other States to seek care, and this will

also make it harder for women of color to access the care they need.

Unfortunately, many States across our country already have rigid and extreme restrictions on the books, and if *Roe* falls, many of those laws will go immediately into effect. In the States that don't have those restrictions, extreme legislatures are pushing new, dangerous, and restrictive anti-choice laws as we speak.

In my home State of Nevada, abortion rights have been enshrined as a State law since Nevadans overwhelmingly voted for it in a ballot initiative in 1990. This means women across Nevada will continue to have access to reproductive care if *Roe* is overturned. But this year, anti-choice politicians are working to eliminate this protection from our State code and take away Nevadan women's rights to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly why the Senate needs to pass the Women's Health Protection Act today, to ensure that women in all 50 States continue to have the right to make their own reproductive healthcare choices.

I helped introduce the Women's Health Protection Act last year because it is the best option we have to codify *Roe v. Wade* into law. This bill will codify the right to receive and provide reproductive healthcare, and it will prohibit States from enacting rigid, medically unnecessary restrictions that make it harder—make it harder—for women to access care.

We are not living in a hypothetical anymore. We are staring a post-*Roe* world in the face and the time to act is now.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have also made it clear that if they regain control of this Chamber, they will pass a national ban on abortion rights and they may go even further.

I urge every Senator who cares about women, who cares about women's health, who cares about women's autonomy and their rights—I urge them all to join me in voting to pass the Women's Health Protection Act. Nevadans are watching, the American people are watching, and women everywhere are depending on us. We cannot let them down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

INFLATION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about inflation and the impact it is having on American citizens across the board and particularly energy prices and how the energy policy of the Biden administration is a big part of the problem in terms of creating the inflation that we face.

I once again urge the Biden administration to reverse course on its harmful energy agenda and instead take the handcuffs off our domestic energy producers.

Americans are struggling to afford to fill their tanks and to keep the lights

on. Higher energy prices are fueling record inflation. We saw the latest statistic of 8.3 percent, which is driving up the costs of goods across the entire economy.

Yesterday, gasoline prices hit an all-time high of \$4.37 a gallon nationwide, and gas is up to an average of \$4.06 a gallon in my home State of North Dakota. Today, gas prices are even higher. That is about an 80-percent increase since President Biden was inaugurated, and that increase—the vast majority of that increase came before Russia invaded Ukraine.

Two years ago, our country was producing almost 13 million barrels per day of oil. Today, our country is producing about 11.3 million barrels a day—again, a direct result of the Biden administration's energy policies making it more difficult to produce energy in America.

President Biden's Green New Deal policies and hostile approach to American oil and gas have curtailed production, and Americans are paying for it every day. It began with the administration's moratorium on new energy leases—closing off access to our abundant, taxpayer-owned energy reserves.

The administration continues to hold up our ability to move more oil and gas across the country by blocking pipelines like the Keystone XL Pipeline. In 2015, the Senate and the House passed my bill, S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. If the Obama-Biden administration had not vetoed that bill, this pipeline would have been bringing in more than 800,000 barrels of oil a day from our closest friend and ally, Canada.

We have stranded natural gas resources in North Dakota and in other parts of the country, like West Virginia and Pennsylvania, because we can't get the permits to build the gathering systems and the pipelines to get it to market, let alone to our allies. We need LNG facilities to help our allies in Western Europe and to help Ukraine as they continue their valiant fight against Russian aggression.

If we really want to cut off the Russian war machine, we need to cut off their ability to sell energy, and that means once again embracing our Nation's most critical economic and national security assets—our country's vast oil and gas reserves. A good start would be to pass my American Energy Independence from Russia Act, which is bicameral legislation that I introduced with nine of my colleagues in the Senate. Our commonsense approach takes immediate action in encouraging U.S. energy production, including increasing access to taxpayer-owned energy reserves on Federal lands, authorizing the construction and operation of the Keystone XL Pipeline, and removing regulatory hurdles to increase liquefied natural gas exports.

North Dakota and other energy-producing States can and should be empowered to unleash the full potential of our abundant oil and gas and coal reserves as well—all of these resources.