

No one does it with better environmental stewardship than we do here in America, and we need to produce that energy here in America.

It is long past time for the Biden administration to get out of the way and take the handcuffs off American energy production. Producing more energy here at home is the solution to helping lower energy costs and providing hard-working families with relief from rising inflation.

I saw that either the President or one of his spokesmen talked about the large amount of energy costs and inflation. Well, we have a solution for that. Why isn't the administration taking steps so that we can produce more energy here at home? That is what needs to happen, and that will benefit every single consumer across this great Nation.

I yield the floor.

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

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, abortion is a heavy issue. We are used to, in this body, debating marginal tax rates and debating spending bills, but this issue is different. This debate cuts to the heart of who we are, what we owe each other, what kind of society we want to preserve, and what kind of society we want to build. The moral weight of this debate is heavy.

Social media, of course, makes it worse; makes it ugly; makes it stupid. There is too little grace. There is not enough compassion. Honesty and genuine good-faith disagreements are really hard to come by. To talk about abortion well, we need to actually listen to each other, and we need to try to understand the best arguments of the other side's and take those arguments seriously.

For Democrats, debating well has to start with recognizing that most Americans believe that unborn lives deserve to be protected at some point during a pregnancy. It is deeply human and deeply compassionate to recognize the humanity of an unborn life. Scientific advances like ultrasounds give us a glimpse into the lives of the unborn, first in black and white and now in 3D, and it is going to be clearer and clearer over time what that little baby is. Any honest conversation about abortion must grapple with the fact that every abortion begins with two lives and destroys one of them. It is deeply wrong to ask Americans to participate in an act that they know takes an innocent life.

For Republicans to debate well, we need to be willing to be honest about the fact that, for some women, pregnancy can be frightening and painful. Many situations are not ideal situations. Pregnancy changes a woman's life in a way that is absolutely unique in the human experience. There is no equivalent to pregnancy. There is no example we can compare it to. That is why the pro-life cause is not and cannot ever primarily be about legislation

or about policy, as important as those can be. The pro-life cause must start with active compassion for moms and babies and especially women whose first thoughts upon learning that they were pregnant was: I can't do this.

To the pro-life movement, I want to recognize your patience and your perseverance over decades. We should commend the ethic of love, persuasion, and prudence that has brought us to the place we are today.

Pro-lifers show up for women and for babies every single day. I see it all over Nebraska, and I know that it is true across all 50 States.

Pro-lifers and especially pro-life women support women through pregnancy care centers. They work in local communities to build support networks. They are persuading their neighbors and are growing a movement that supports life.

We don't have the massive war chest, the army of lawyers, or the fancy PR shops that Planned Parenthood does, but what we do have is truth and love.

Thousands of pregnancy care centers provide women and their babies with free help—with lots of free help. The volunteers who show up every day to help these women obviously don't do it for money; they do it out of love.

Thousands of pro-life families adopt kids every year, and their hearts overflow with love as they welcome a new child into their families. That is the core meaning of the pro-life movement. It is not about legislation first or about legislation second or about legislation third.

Advocates for abortion-on-demand are doing a lot of fearmongering. We have heard some bizarre speeches on the floor in the last couple of days that are so disconnected from the reality of the text of the legislation that is before us. So much of what they are pushing is wildly out of touch with the public and wildly out of touch with modern science.

We already know that America's abortion laws are far, far more permissive than Europe's and that, on this subject, our laws have a lot more in common with the human rights abusers China and North Korea than with anything in French law. The legislation before us today would make our laws even more extreme. Depending on how you count, we have the fourth to seventh most extreme pro-abortion laws of any of the 200 nations on Earth, and the legislation before the Senate today would make the U.S. position even more extreme.

There was a time when the Democratic Party talked about abortion as being safe, legal, and rare—safe, legal, and rare. Not anymore. This legislation is not from your mom's Democratic Party.

In recent years, we have taken votes on my legislation, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It is a pretty simple, straightforward bill that aims to protect babies who survive botched abortions. There are no

restrictions on abortion access in my bill, just a simple requirement that, if a baby is born alive in an abortion clinic, she must receive the same level of care she would have received had she been born in a hospital. That is it. Yet Senator SCHUMER and the abortion lobby have filibustered this legislation over and over. It is so weird.

So here we are today. The abortion industry's lobbyists have bullied Leader SCHUMER and all but one courageous Democratic Senator, my friend JOE MANCHIN, into an extreme position that doesn't reflect even the majority opinion of the Democratic Party today, let alone the position of Americans.

This bill today is ugly, winner-takes-all politics. It is full of aggressive pro-abortion provisions. Let's consider just a few.

One, it would formally create a national right to abortion up until the moment of birth in all 50 States, and it would undo even State-based partial-birth abortion bans.

Two, today's legislation would prohibit States from requiring parental consent to perform abortions on a child.

Three, it would prohibit States from passing any laws to ban sex-selective abortions. It would ban any laws that States would have to try to prevent sex-selective abortions.

It would create a right for nondocors to perform abortions, putting women at severe risk of complications and botched procedures.

It would remove conscience protections that keep Americans from being forced to perform or fund abortions if they have moral objections. Think about that. It would force Catholic hospitals to perform abortions. That is new. That is gross.

Where is the tolerance? Where is the compassion? Where is the humanity? Where is the attempt to understand that the majority of Americans want there to be prohibitions on abortions at some point in the pregnancy?

Americans don't want the kind of radicalism we see in this bill before us today. In recent polling, 65 percent of Americans say they support banning abortion in the second trimester, and 80 percent of Americans support banning abortion in the third trimester. Why? Well, one of the reasons is because they have seen a lot of images of what a baby looks like in utero in the second and third trimester.

Just to reiterate, contrary to the last, I guess, couple of speeches ago, the last speech on this topic on the floor, 80 percent of Americans want to see abortion banned in the third trimester. It is hard to get 80 percent of Americans to agree on anything, and yet 80 percent agree that third-trimester abortions—the kind of thing that this bill wants to make sure is explicitly championed—States could not prevent and prohibit third-trimester abortions. That is what this bill is about.

This bill is incredibly extreme. There is no moderation in this bill, just brutal indifference hiding behind euphemisms. Fortunately, it won't pass. Unfortunately, our debate about it isn't very honest here. Fortunately, the pro-abortion lobby isn't winning. Majority Leader SCHUMER will earn kudos from Planned Parenthood for this show vote today, but he is not going to convince anyone.

As we look beyond today's gross vote, as we look to the future, our focus should be on continuing to grow the pro-life coalition in this country. We can and we must build support across the country for an ethic that protects life.

I want to lock arms with pro-life Democrats and work to build a culture of life. If we can pair certain pro-life laws with increased spending on prenatal care and safety nets for struggling moms, count me in. I am for that kind of big, new coalition. Let's do it.

This movement is about hearts and minds. We have got to have difficult conversations and love, and we have got to reject the kind of extremism that Senator SCHUMER is putting on the floor today pursuing this bill. We have got to focus our work on our local communities, on changing our neighbors' minds, on understanding each other, and on setting an example by putting moms and babies first.

The answer, after this bill fails today, is to remember that love is stronger than power, and that is why life is going to win. Being pro-life means being pro-science, pro-mom, and pro-baby. It means starting with love, not with legislation. Happily, it definitely doesn't mean starting with the grotesque legislation that will be voted down this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, last week, a draft opinion was leaked out of the Supreme Court, which never happens. It literally has not ever happened until now. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court called it a betrayal of the Court.

That leak sparked protests all over the Nation and in Washington, DC, but not because two centuries of protocol in the Supreme Court was violated; it was because the Court dared to say that when the Supreme Court ruled in 1973 on *Roe v. Wade*, it made a mistake. In the draft opinion that was released, it stated that the opinion of 1973 exceeded the constitutional boundaries.

For 200 years, legislatures determined when life began, but in 1973 the Court determined that States cannot protect its youngest citizens of their State and created a new standard called viability, a standard that had no statement in the Constitution and no statement in Federal law. They literally created the viability standard on the spot.

The draft opinion from February of this year states that that should not have been done in 1973 and that the

people in each State, in the legislatures, should determine when life begins and that they should have that decision based in law.

Apparently this body, including the Democratic majority, agrees at least with the basic finding of the Court's draft decision because the Court says these issues should be settled in legislative branches, not in the Court. And so today, a week after that draft opinion is out, Senator SCHUMER has called up a bill to actually vote on *Roe v. Wade*—and not just vote on *Roe v. Wade*, vote on a very simple decision: When does life begin?

The real question that comes up is, "When is that child a child," because in the most simple of questions, for those two little ones whom I know, only a short time before would have been in the womb. So the simple question that this body is dealing with today is pretty straightforward: Who gets to decide whether she lives or dies? Who gets to pick that?

I think she should live, and for that simple statement that I believe she should have a chance at life, I have been called a totalitarian, radical extremist because I believe her life is valuable. What kind of upside-down world do we live in, when people who believe children are valuable are the extremists, are the radicals, are the totalitarians?

The day before Mother's Day, the headquarters for Concerned Women for America, a pro-life organization that speaks up for the millions of women who believe children are valuable, was attacked and vandalized. On Mother's Day—Mother's Day—just let that soak in for a minute. On Mother's Day, someone tried to burn down a pregnancy resource center in Wisconsin that provides baby formula, baby clothing, and diapers to new moms and provides ultrasounds to expectant moms. That facility they attempted to burn down, and then they spray-painted on the wall outside the building: "If abortions aren't safe then you aren't either."

Instead of that being condemned by the media, a journalist from Rewire saw the news story on the attack in Wisconsin and immediately tweeted out:

More of this. May these people never know a moment of peace or safety until they rot in the ground.

Also, on Mother's Day, protesters showed up at Catholic churches around the country to protest the Catholic Church's stand for this little girl and for life. Protesters also showed up over and over in the last week at the Justices' homes to chant on bullhorns and to threaten the Justices because they dare to follow the Constitution.

A CNN commentator tweeted out:

Concrete barriers being put up around the Supreme Court. Now we just need to lock them in there and keep them away from us—and cut off their internet access so they can't send us more opinions based on pro-rap judicial theory from the 1600s.

I have heard it all week—all week long on this floor, tweeted out by journalists, tweeted out by activists—simple statements like this: equity, privacy rights, bodily autonomy, healthcare decisions, freedom to choose, reproductive rights, basic civil rights.

All those are euphemisms for she dies. Why are people so passionate about this? Because it is not just a person in this conversation; she is in this conversation. Her future, her opportunities—that is what this conversation is about. And, for that, I am being called a radical extremist because I believe she is valuable.

Last weekend, when I was at home, I ran into someone just out and about who wanted to talk to me about this issue, about life, who was very passionate about the freedom to be able to take her life just hours before she is born. And in that conversation, as we got back and forth on it, I asked him very simply: You know it is Federal law right now that we protect turtle eggs. Turtles—if you destroy a turtle egg, it is a Federal offense with a very big fine. If you destroy an eagle egg, it is a very big offense with a Federal fine. Do you find that odd?

I am just in dialogue with this person: Do you find that odd that in Federal law we protect an eagle egg, acknowledging that is an eagle inside that egg, and we protect a turtle egg, saying we acknowledge that is a turtle inside that egg, but we allow the destruction of children?

And, to my shock, they responded: Well, turtles and eagles are endangered so they should be protected.

And I am called the extremist because I happen to believe she is precious and, just because there are billions of other humans around, I don't think she is disposable.

What are we really talking about? We are talking about the right for people to be able to speak out to their elected officials, in every State, and for each State legislature to decide on the issue of life. That is what we are talking about.

If the draft opinion ends up being the final opinion from the Court, it doesn't end abortion in America; it pushes it back out to every State and every legislative branch, including this one, to be able to have a State-by-State and a national dialogue on this simple question: When does life begin?

Some people will say at conception, as I do, and, quite frankly, as science also agrees with. That is cell division. That is unique DNA. All the makeups of her life and of my life and every other person in this room's life were there at cell division and conception in the earliest days.

Every single cell in the woman's body is exactly the same, has the same DNA in it, except for those cells. Those cells are different. They have different DNA in them. Why is there different DNA in those particular cells than

every other cell in the mom's body? Because that is a different body that is there. That is why.

Some people believe that life begins at conception. Some people believe at heartbeat. Some people believe at 15 weeks, as the Mississippi law is challenging. Some people believe at viability, others at birth.

Why don't we have that conversation? Why don't we have that dialogue? Because, quite frankly, as I think about life and I look at this baby and I look at this baby—for some reason, there are a whole bunch of people who say that baby is alive and that baby is tissue and not alive. Some people would look at this baby and this baby and would say: totally different, completely different; this baby is alive and needs to be protected, and that baby is just tissue—which is so strange to me because that baby and that baby look a lot alike to me.

I can count fingers on both. In fact, as funny as it is, they are both in the same position, which, by the way, for my wife and I, we call this the touchdown position, how babies sleep with their hands up over their heads. And lots of babies do that, including mine did. This baby is in the touchdown position and sleeping, and this one is too.

What is the difference between these two? I don't see this as alive and tissue. That looks a lot like a baby to me. And, for that, I am called the extremist and the radical.

This baby sucks their thumb in the womb, responds to their mom's voice, feels pain, has unique fingerprints, has unique DNA, kicks around like crazy. What is the difference between those two? Time. That is it. That is the only difference. Just time.

So what has been brought to the floor today? What has been brought to the floor today is this bill—this bill—the Women's Health Protection Act of 2022. Interestingly enough, that is the last time this bill uses the word "woman." It doesn't use the word "woman" anytime after the title. It stops after that. I find that interesting.

Let me talk you through a couple of things that are in this bill. Section 2 of the bill defines "abortion services" and details it out but also has a nice little note that is tucked into the definition here. It defines "viability" and says:

The term "viability" means the point in a pregnancy at which, in the good-faith medical judgment of the treating health care provider, based on the particular facts of the case before the health care provider, there is a reasonable likelihood of sustained fetal survival outside the uterus with or without artificial support.

Interestingly enough, it just basically says the doctor that is there that is providing the abortion can determine when the child is viable or not viable.

We all get the joke on this. We know what this really means. This bill is not about viability; this bill is about whatever age, at whatever time anyone wants to perform an abortion—at any moment.

In my State, we are a State that has medical marijuana laws. They say it is not recreational marijuana; it is medical marijuana. You have to have a medical prescription from a doctor to be able to get it. Do you know how you get it? The medical marijuana place actually has a doctor that you can just call that will write a script for you that will write it for no matter what. You can say: My left toe hurts every other Thursday. And they would say: Great, that is a medical condition, and you get a medical prescription for it.

We get the joke. If the person actually selling the product is the one actually prescribing it, that means you can do it at any point. This bill, itself, protects that individual, saying they can define viability and they are protected in their definition of it.

This bill is not about protecting children prior to viability. This bill is about aborting at every single stage of pregnancy, all the way up to the end, no matter how late that abortion is.

The bill doesn't just stop there. Not only is there no limit for restriction on abortion, it gives a statutory right to abortion. Even though 71 percent of Americans believe there should be some limits to abortion, this bill says no, there can't be.

Then it reaches into every State and abolishes any restrictions that may be on abortion at all in any State. For instance, if a State says there has to be more information given to a woman, like an ultrasound or just information about this child, it abolishes that, so a State cannot inform the mom before the abortion. That is prohibited.

It also abolishes any other restriction on telemedicine. It abolishes any requirement any State has on safety or health. It used to be—I heard the term from the pro-abortion crowd—"safe, legal, and rare." This strips away the "safe" term on it and says every restriction that is out there on safety has to be stripped away; no State can put a restriction out there on this.

It takes away any right of any State to actually restrict abortions being carried out on minors without parental consent. It strips away any kind of waiting period laws.

It also strips away religious exemptions. What does that mean? If a doctor or physician says: I don't want to carry out an abortion; I believe that is really a child right there, not just a lump of tissue, then that doctor says for their conscience sake—through this bill: I am sorry, your conscience doesn't matter any more. It strips away all conscience protections.

What is interesting is the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was passed in 1993. It has never ever been accepted until this bill. This bill, literally, reaches into the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and says: Your religious conscience doesn't matter. It is an abortion. Get over it. That is what this bill says.

This is not some simple codifying Roe bill. This is telling the Nation: I

am sorry, you may think that little girl is a little girl and is valuable; we think she is disposable. No.

Listen, pro-life Members here, like myself, have fought to make adoption more affordable, expand the child tax credit for the unborn, continue to provide assistance, food, healthcare to needy families, maternal health. We should all be working to support women in very difficult days, but she matters in this conversation. We can't lose track of that.

Mother Teresa once made the comment:

[I]f we accept that a mother can kill even her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another?

You may say, well, that is Mother Teresa's opinion that that child is a child. I would also tell you, it is Joe Biden's, as well. Joe Biden also made the statement just last week. The Dobbs' decision is about the ability to abort a child—to abort a child was President Biden's statement. I agree.

The conversation right now on the floor is what is her future? What happens next will decide a lot. I can assure you, I am going to speak about the rights for every single child and will declare, again, any child is valuable. If people call me a radical for believing children are valuable, so be it, but I think it tells us a lot about our culture that I am the radical one because I believe she has a hope and a future.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, like many Americans, I was profoundly disappointed to learn from news reports last week of the Supreme Court's draft opinion that would overturn Roe v. Wade. Roe has been the law of the land for nearly 50 years. Generations of women have relied on its protections in shaping their lives. In fact, most American women have lived their entire lives knowing they have the right to make decisions about their own bodies.

Now, the Supreme Court appears ready to take that right away with the stroke of a pen. If it does this, I believe that this Court would be ignoring precedent and gutting a half-century of progress for women. And in doing so, the Court would devalue women's health and women's lives.

Make no mistake: If this draft opinion becomes final, the consequences would be serious and would affect women throughout our country. The impacts could be devastating. According to an analysis by the New York Times, approximately half of U.S. States are poised to ban or severely restrict access to abortion if this opinion becomes final.

Some States, including Texas and Oklahoma, have already passed laws banning abortion after the sixth week of pregnancy. That is before many women even know they are pregnant. Those laws are unconstitutional today under Roe, but could be put into effect immediately if the Court strikes Roe down. Other States may go even further, either by banning abortion after

the moment of conception or by making abortion a homicide, as a Louisiana bill would do.

And several across the country have bans in place that lack any exceptions, including for rape or incest. These would take effect immediately if Roe were overturned. If these draconian State laws go into effect, women would lose the ability to make a decision about a pregnancy after experiencing a traumatic sexual assault; women could be forced to endure a pregnancy, even if that pregnancy could possibly kill them; and women could lose access to important fertility treatments like in vitro fertilization, a medical advancement that many people rely on to build their families.

These State laws could also add to the already monumental pain associated with miscarriage by dangling the threat of criminal charges over the head of any woman who loses a child during pregnancy.

The majority of Americans alive today do not remember a time before Roe became the law of the land. They don't know what it was like before the United States recognized this important right. I remember the days when abortion was illegal. I remember passing a hat in college to collect money so a classmate could go to Mexico for an abortion.

Women who could not afford to travel were forced into even more dangerous alternatives at home. They were often forced to self-induce, sometimes with a fatal result. It is these women, many who cannot afford to travel to another State for an abortion, who will be harmed the most by the Supreme Court's decision if it becomes final.

If this draft opinion should become final, around half of all American women would find themselves living in States that make access to safe abortion care difficult or impossible. And the harm from this decision will fall disproportionately on low-income, at-risk, and minority women. Forty-nine percent of women who have had an abortion live below the poverty line. And these women would be forced to travel long distances at great cost in order to secure an abortion.

For example, women who live in Mississippi now have to travel an average of 67 miles, one way, to receive an abortion. If the Court were to strike down Roe and abortion clinics were forced to shutter, women would have to drive on average nearly 500 miles, one way, to reach an out-of-state abortion clinic. That much travel would be impossible for many women, particularly those who already have young children at home, those who cannot afford the cost of the flight or gas money, or those who cannot take time off from work.

Furthermore, studies have shown that there is a direct link between lack of abortion access and maternal mortality. An analysis by the Center for American Progress shows that between 2010 and 2015, when several States en-

acted new laws restricting abortion access, the maternal mortality rate rose by 136 percent.

Let's be clear: Restricting a woman's legal access to abortion healthcare will not stop women from seeking out that care. It will only make the process of seeking an abortion much less safe. Many women will be forced to endure unregulated and dangerous procedures, while others will attempt self-managed medication abortions at home. Lives will be lost.

In conclusion, this potential decision by the Supreme Court would have dangerous consequences for millions of Americans. We reduce the value of a woman's life when we take away her ability to control her own body.

Now, Congress must do everything it can to ensure that individuals are able to access critical medical care and make the best decisions possible for their health. It is more important than ever that Congress passes the Women's Health Protection Act to safeguard Federal protections for women seeking abortion care. We cannot stand idly by and allow the lives of women everywhere to be endangered by this ill-conceived effort to overturn our fundamental rights.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor in support of codifying Roe v. Wade through the Women's Health Protection Act.

As the Senate considers this vital piece of legislation today, I feel duty bound to impress upon my colleagues the grave implications should we fail to protect a women's freedom to choose.

After all, the right to choose is a fundamental right. It is the right to bodily autonomy—to decide when and how and with whom to start a family.

It is a right that, when faced with one the hardest decisions of their lives, grants women in America the peace of mind of knowing the decision is between them, their doctor, and their faith—no one else.

Last January marked 49 years since Roe v. Wade was decided—49 years since the fundamental right for women to make their own medical decisions became the law of the land.

For nearly half a century, Roe v. Wade has been decided, affirmed, and reaffirmed as a legal bedrock of the constitutional right to privacy.

Overtaking it would take us back to a place no one wants to go. A dark place in history that would open the door to overturning settled decisions on critical issues.

It would jeopardize fundamental rights like the right to gay marriage, to private consensual sex between adults, and even contraception.

Voting rights, civil rights, and LGBTQI rights would all be on the chopping blocks.

It is an existential threat, not just to women, but to EVERY American.

I, for one, refuse to accept this version of our country.

I refuse to go back to the days when women, particularly low-income

women and women of color, were subjected to government intrusion by male politicians who think they know best.

One of these women is named Dorothy Carlos, an 81-year old constituent of mine in Englewood, NJ. After graduating from high school, Ms. Carlos planned to go to nursing school and then maybe become a doctor. The year was 1958. After weeks without a check-up, she went in for an exam and found out she was pregnant. Ms. Carlos was 17 years old at the time. In an instant, her dreams of going to nursing school were dashed. This was before Roe v. Wade and before the right to choose.

The day Ms. Dorothy Carlos' life completely changed was nearly 65 years ago, but she still remembers it like it was yesterday. Not going to nursing school meant that she had to go on public assistance, relying on Medicaid and food stamps to provide for her family. Not having the freedom to choose stopped her career in its tracks—and when she called my office last week, her main concern was for the women who would be put in a similar position without the right to choose.

So I say again, I refuse to go back to the days when women like Ms. Carlos had their dreams deferred because they didn't have control over their own bodies. I refuse to go back to the days when abortion was illegal and, therefore, unregulated—when thousands of women a year were hospitalized and even died as a result of unsafe procedures—because, make no mistake, banning abortion does not stop abortions from happening; it just stops safe ones from being carried out. Despite what others refuse to accept, abortion is an integral part of maternal healthcare.

Just ask Monica Attias, who bravely shared her story just a few days ago about how an abortion saved her life. Twenty-two years ago, Monica had complications during her second pregnancy that left her in a medically induced coma. Her husband Philippe was told that she had a one in four chance of survival and to prepare for the worst. She thankfully survived, albeit with a heart condition that required medication.

However, 9 months after a pregnancy nearly killed her, she became pregnant again. Neither her cardiologist nor her obstetrician could guarantee that she would survive another one. The best decision for Monica Attias was to have an abortion.

As she puts it, "I loved the children I had too much to possibly allow them to grow up without a mother because she risked her life trying to have another child."

Given what would happen if Roe v. Wade is struck down, Monica wonders if she would have been judged at-risk enough to qualify for a legal abortion.

Thankfully, in New Jersey, the freedom to seek and obtain abortion care is protected under law. But in far too many States, 22 to be exact, overturning Roe would immediately roll

back the fundamental right to choose. Many of them would not have exceptions for rape, incest, or risks to the mother's life like Monica Attias. Some of them would ban abortions after just 6 weeks, before women like Dorothy Carlos realize they are pregnant.

I refuse to go back to patchwork of laws. Rights are rights, and I refuse a version of our country where some women have fundamental rights while other women are left behind. I refuse to stand by and let our healthcare system be split further between the wealthy and the working poor.

The freedom to make medical decisions with your healthcare provider belongs to all Americans. Every American has the right to privacy, whether you live in Nebraska or New Jersey. We will not be silent as it is stripped away.

It is why we will be voting on the appropriately named Women's Health Protection Act, to protect bodily autonomy and prevent government bans. The Women's Health Protection Act would end the undue restrictions on abortion by repealing the slew of harmful State laws that have shut down healthcare clinics and providers all across the country in recent years. It would ensure that the protections granted by Roe today are the protections granted tomorrow.

A strong majority of Americans—over 70 percent—have consistently agreed that the constitutional right to choose should be the law of the land. They support Roe v. Wade, despite my Republican colleagues who are hell-bent on policing women's bodies.

These are the same colleagues who call themselves pro-life but refuse to fund maternal care, childcare, family leave, access to healthcare, education, and will never prioritize equal pay—the same Republican colleagues who would force women to give birth while opposing policies that benefit mothers, those who, after waging a decades-long war on the rights of 169 million women in our country, are now more focused on a leak than on the consequences of their misguided actions.

Today, let us reaffirm that women deserve to have the full range of options available when it comes to something as personal as the decision to start a family. Let us unequivocally and unapologetically say that reproductive rights are human rights and that an attack on the rights of women and girls is an attack on all of us.

Let us pass the Women's Health Protection Act and ensure that reproductive freedom is the law of the land across our country for this generation and for generations to come.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes, followed by Senator MURRAY up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall votes.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Senator LANKFORD just said this bill is all about legalizing abortion any time, any place in this

country. He is right, but I am going to add that this legislation is being discussed for political purposes, and we are wasting time on this issue because we could be spending time on things that people want.

I have been hearing the Democrats speak for a year and a half about the necessity of getting prescription drug prices down. Why couldn't we be talking about that instead of wasting time on this legislation that is to make a political point instead of accomplishing something?

I would like to speak, then, about the very extreme legislation being pushed by Democrats—the Women's Health Protection Act. Democrats are using a leaked Supreme Court draft—not even a final decision—as an excuse to push a very radical legislation that goes beyond public opinion or even common sense on abortion. This bill goes much further than its stated position to codify Roe v. Wade decision.

As ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have raised many concerns about this legislation. The so-called Women's Health Protection Act would invalidate hundreds of abortion-related laws in our various States, such as clinic regulations, admitting privileges requirements, regulations on abortion-inducing drugs, reflection periods, conscience protections, sex selection bans, and limitations on the use of State funds and facilities for abortion training.

Iowa and many other States have taken action on their own to enact commonsense restrictions. I don't think this bill is common sense because it allows late-term abortions, which could be up even to the day of birth. Some States have protected individuals from having to perform abortions against their own religious beliefs.

We can't stand by as those commonsense laws are under attack by the Democrats. And this legislation attacks those laws. The bill before us would invalidate these State laws and would allow abortion providers to set the standard of care for their patients with no oversight from the States. It would allow healthcare workers to determine when a life is viable, which will lead then to inconsistent practices across the country and endanger the lives of mothers everywhere.

If the bill before us were to be signed into law, the Federal Government would send a message to States that enacting laws to protect patients and regulate the health and welfare of their citizens is not the right of the Federal Government.

It would allow Congress to intrude on States' rights and nullify lifesaving laws on the books. It would invalidate the police powers of the State under the 10th amendment in regard to those police powers affecting the health of its citizens. In addition, this bill establishes no private right for women harmed by abortions.

How can we, as Congress, stand up and say that we are protecting women

when, really, this bill disregards any loss of life of babies, including full-term infants and even some mothers? Democrats claim this bill is a necessary and moderate step. How can a sweeping piece of legislation that would overrule dozens of State laws and establishing terminating a pregnancy as the only option be classified as a moderate piece of legislation? No, this proposed legislation is an example of extreme extremism.

It is unfortunate that the majority is using this issue to appear compassionate and concerned about women's rights when, in reality, the bill disregards popular and commonsense laws that protect women and children across the country. Large majorities of Americans support strong abortion restrictions this bill would overturn.

I understand and appreciate the robust debate around this subject. However, I am uncomfortable with the rhetoric of some of my colleagues. They refuse to discuss important priorities of what the American people want and only want to push one extreme option. Let me be clear. Abortion should not be promoted as a default contraception and family-planning tool. Let's have a productive discussion on what can be done to support women and families. It is important to be open with our colleagues and peers on our differences, but we must unite to protect life because every single life is precious.

The Women's Health Protection Act is an extreme piece of legislation that completely disregards human life. I intend to vote against the motion to proceed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SCHUMER be recognized following my remarks prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, last week, the country learned that the Supreme Court is preparing to overturn Roe v. Wade, and the constitutional right to abortion, and make this the first generation of women in this country to have fewer rights than their mothers. Think about that for a second. My daughter, my granddaughters will have fewer rights than I did. I truly never thought I would say that and it breaks my heart.

These past few days have just been heart-wrenching. I have seen the emotion and I have felt it. Let me tell you something. As heartbroken as people are, they are also mad and you can't blame them. And I am mad, too, because we are watching the Supreme Court prepare to drag this country backward by half a century.

Across the country, Republicans and State legislatures are banning abortion and they are making it crystal clear they are going to go even further. They

are coming after your mail because they want to make it illegal to send abortion medication in the mail. They are coming after your birth control. They are coming after Plan B and IUDs.

And right here in the Senate, they are talking about a Federal abortion ban—a Federal abortion ban. That means a ban even in States like mine where the right to abortion is now protected. Senate Republicans want to make sure women from Seattle to New York cannot make their own healthcare decisions.

For many Republicans, this is just the beginning. But to everyone who is scared, everyone who is furious, know this: They have some big roadblocks in their way. Me, Senate Democrats, House Democrats, and millions of patients across this country who are going to stand up and speak out.

So I rise today to make sure women across the country have their voices heard. I rise to make sure Republicans have to show their true colors, to make sure every single one of them is forced to go on the record when it comes to the right to abortion, when it comes to the right of every patient to make their own decisions about their body, every mother to make their own decisions about their family, every woman to make their own decisions about the future, because while Republicans have constantly been attacking the right to abortion—and they have been pushing that day in and day out for decades, by the way—they have been almost silent on what overturning *Roe v. Wade* will actually mean for people.

Taking away a woman's bodily autonomy—which, let's be clear, is exactly what Republicans are talking about here—impacts her whole life. Forced pregnancy limits a woman's entire economic future. It takes away her ability to determine the direction of her own life. It forces women to be pregnant and give birth when they don't want to, no matter their individual circumstances. It hurts people in real and irreparable ways.

I know, after so many decades of precedent, an end to the right so many women have lived with their entire life seems completely unthinkable, but this is real. This is happening. And Republicans have been preparing for this for decades.

We are about to see a tidal wave of abortion bans across the country, so this vote today will force Republicans to face up to the hurt and suffering they have caused and will cause, the lives that hang in the balance.

We all know that if *Roe* falls, the heaviest burdens will land on those who already face the greatest challenges: mothers who are barely scraping by. It is Black women who already face a severe maternal mortality crisis. It is indigenous women, especially those on Tribal lands, who suffer from violence at unprecedented levels. It is women with disabilities, who may already face discrimination in routine

medical care. It is women in rural communities, who have less resources and are often already forced to drive miles to get the care they need. It is immigrant women, especially undocumented women. It is our gay and trans neighbors, whom Republicans never seem to miss an opportunity to scapegoat or bully.

People in my State need to know this will impact them, too, and many of my colleagues know I am not one to grandstand or exaggerate the scope of a crisis that comes before the Senate. When I said this was a five-alarm fire, I meant it. We need to be clear-eyed that this will impact all of us.

For one thing, we know the healthcare crises caused by abortion bans—and that is what they are: crises—will stretch across State lines. When Texas passed a law letting people sue strangers for getting or providing an abortion, desperate patients rushed to Oklahoma, only for that State to pass an extreme ban as well, meaning more patients traveling even farther, with fewer options to get the care they need. We are seeing this firsthand in my home State of Washington. After Idaho passed a draconian abortion ban of its own, my State had to brace for incoming patients surging into Washington.

So there can be no question, if *Roe* is struck down nationally, if individual States across the country ban the right to abortion, people in every single State will live with the painful consequences of that decision, and they will not forget that Republicans are the ones responsible for this.

Let's also remember that Republicans have been clear, they have been explicit even, that they are not going to stop at *Roe*, they are not going to stop at the State level, and they are not going to stop at abortion. I can't say this enough. Republicans are already talking about passing a Federal ban on abortion. Republicans are already talking about how Griswold, the case that struck down a ban on birth control, might have been "wrongly decided." Republicans are already talking about banning IUDs, Plan B. They even held a vote a few weeks ago to undermine our Federal Family Planning Program and make it harder for people to get birth control.

It is clearer than ever that because of Republicans' extremism, not only is the right to abortion at risk but other important rights are as well. That is why people are so scared, and that is why they are so shocked.

Someone back home said to me last week: What can I tell women in our State so they don't worry?

I said straight up: I am not telling anyone not to worry. I am scared, and I am frightened for women in this country more than I ever have been before.

I am very fearful, but I am also determined, and I know people across the country do not want to go backwards. They do not want politicians planning

their families for them. They do not want politicians forcing people to stay pregnant. They do not want this to be the first generation of women with fewer rights than their mothers, which is why today we are now voting on the Women's Health Protection Act.

What this bill does is simple. It follows the Constitution and nearly half a century of precedent and gives the patient the right to get an abortion no matter where in America that patient or doctor lives. And the question every single Senator today is asked is simple as well: Do you trust women? Do you trust patients? Do you trust doctors? Do you believe every American should be able to make deeply personal decisions about pregnancy and parenting according to their own beliefs, without government interference?

If your answer is yes, then your vote on this bill should be as well. If your answer is no, if you think women should have fewer rights, if you think it is OK for Republican politicians to force someone else to stay pregnant or give birth when they don't want to, you are going to have to go on the record and let your constituents know that you think your personal opinion matters more than their own medical decisions. And you better believe no one will forget this.

I yield the floor.

(Disturbance in the Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senate will be in order. Thank you.

Expressions of approval are not allowed by the Gallery.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, may I first thank my dear friend and colleague from Washington for her powerful and heartfelt words and for her leadership as well.

Now, the question before the Senate is simple. As women's rights face their greatest threat in half a century, will this Chamber step into the breach and protect the basic right to choose? Will we enshrine into law what courts have held for decades—that decisions women make about their pregnancies belong to them and them alone—or will five unelected Justices, presiding without accountability in a courtroom across the street, take a fundamental right away from millions upon millions of women in this country?

In a few minutes, it will be time for Members to vote. The legislation before this Chamber is straightforward. It would codify what Americans already believe: that the right to choose whether or not to have an abortion belongs to women, not elected politicians. It will preserve the safeguard that conservative Justices seem ready to strike down in just a few weeks.

If they follow through with their decision, the United States, which has always aspired to the expansion of rights, will take a shameful and repressive step backward. Our kids will grow up in a country with fewer rights than those who came before them.

This decision, if formalized, would be remembered as one of the worst and most damaging cases in the entire history of the Supreme Court. So this is not a theoretical exercise, oh, no. Protecting the right to choose at this critical moment is one of the most consequential votes we could possibly take, and the American people are watching. The public will not forget which side of the vote Senators fall on today. They will not forget who voted to protect their freedoms. And they will not forget those responsible for the greatest backslide of individual liberties in half a century.

Across the country, the hard right is hell-bent on sending women's rights back to the stone age, and we in the Senate must respond. We must respond to radicals who want to ban abortions as early as 6 weeks—before many women know they are pregnant. We must respond to extremists who want to prosecute and imprison women and doctors for carrying out an abortion, and even friends who merely provide rides to clinics could end up in jail. We must respond to the swell of hard-right ideologues who openly champion restrictions without exceptions for rape or incest. We must oppose the vision that MAGA Republicans clamor for—forced pregnancies, punishment for women and doctors, and zero exceptions for rape or incest. This is not what America wants. I hope it is not what Members of this Chamber want either.

I implore everyone whose conscience has been jolted over the past week to vote in favor of today's measure. Indeed, I implore everyone who cares about the rights of not just women but of all Americans to support this measure because if five unelected Justices are allowed to decide the fates of millions of women, if the rights women have relied upon for 50 years wither away like ash, if we do not take a stand now to protect a woman's right to choose, then, mark my words, it will be open season—open season—on our God-given freedoms in this great and grand country. Today, it will be Roe. Tomorrow, it will be a national ban on abortion and beyond that, something even more dreadful.

We cannot allow this shameful backslide to happen. We cannot allow the whims of MAGA Republicans to bully the rest of the country into submission.

I urge my colleagues, take a stand. I urge my colleagues and Americans to fight back. I urge Americans and everyone here to defend the right to choose. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON BEDOYA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent on the Bedoya nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 169 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—50

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the nomination is confirmed.

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 actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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. 362, S. 4132, a bill to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard Blumenthal, John W. Hickenlooper, Jacky Rosen, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Tina Smith, Tammy Baldwin, Alex Padilla, Margaret Wood Hassan, Ben Ray Lujan, Catherine Cortez Masto, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Debbie Stabenow, Tammy Duckworth, Richard J. Durbin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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. 4132, a bill to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Booker	Kelly	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Carper	Lujan	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—51

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 51.

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.

CLOTURE MOTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 865, Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz,