

Even Republicans have wonderful things to say about Joe. That is not something you see on every Senate Committee.

Joe, I know I speak for all of us, Republicans included, when I say we will miss you deeply. I am so grateful to have had your leadership and friendship as we have steered the Agriculture Committee together. We have an amazing, talented ag staff because of you and your leadership.

I wish you and Virginia and your two beautiful children much success and happiness as you move forward to your new adventures. I know you will be successful, and I look forward to celebrating all the success.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON THE ACCESSION OF THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND AND THE KINGDOM OF SWEDEN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 5, Treaty document No. 117-3, with all remaining provisions of the previous order in effect.

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

Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following: a treaty, which the clerk will state.

The treaty will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty document No. 117-3, Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of the Republic of Finland and the Kingdom of Sweden.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 3 hours of debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, on the treaties and resolution of advice and consent to ratification.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, while I know the Senate and the American people's attention has been drawn in many different directions over the past couple of months, and while we are still working through numerous legislative proposals to address real challenges that families across the United States are facing, from high food prices to gas prices to devastating natural disasters exacerbated by climate change, I am here today to encourage my colleagues to support the United States taking an important step forward in affirming our commitment to freedom, democracy, and collective defense; to send a signal to the world that we will unite against those actors who seek to destabilize the supply of food that threatens hunger for millions of people all over the world, who seek to weaponize energy in the

middle of an unprecedented heat wave, and who think they can simply invade a neighbor with no consequences.

As we grapple with the complex geopolitics, Putin's generals are bombing Ukrainian cities. His forces are still largely blockading Ukrainian ports. His soldiers are committing war crimes. These are not only attacks on brave Ukrainians, they are attacks on the rule of international law of which we all want to live by. They are attacks on the international order. They are attacks on one of the most deeply held American principles of a nation's right to determine its own destiny.

And so, I rise today in support of strengthening one of the greatest tools the United States has to bolster our efforts to protect those very democratic values and our citizens: the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, known as NATO, one of the greatest alliances the world has ever seen. Welcoming Sweden and Finland into the NATO alliance will signal the United States' ongoing commitment to peace, stability, and democracy in Europe and around the world.

Enlarging NATO is exactly the opposite of what Putin envisioned when he ordered his tanks to invade Ukraine. Indeed, he may have been trying to test the resolve of the alliance. And I am pleased that we have passed that test with overwhelming unity of vision and purpose.

He hoped to quickly gobble up territory to correct what he has called "the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the century," which, in essence, is the dissolution of what was the Soviet Union with little resistance from the countries who formally united in a values-based front against the ills of that vision for Europe and for the world. But instead of a quick strike, Ukrainians—from soldiers to schoolteachers—bravely fought back.

Instead of a Russian coup in Kyiv, President Zelenskyy rallied his nation. Instead of a divided West, we have been more united than ever. The United States, the overwhelming majority of Europe, and, indeed, the entire free world have come together to support Ukraine, to support democracies and the rule of law, and to defend against brazen authoritarian aggression worldwide.

However, despite the fact that Putin's distorted world view has run into the reality of a reenergized North Atlantic Treaty Organization, this has not dissuaded him. This has not tempered his resentment of the West. This has not stopped him from using food and gas as a weapon of war. This has not curbed the threat of further Russian aggression. And so it is absolutely critical that we take this historic step today and provide our advice and consent to ratifying the accession protocols for Sweden and Finland to join the NATO alliance.

More than ever, it is crystal clear that NATO plays a vital role for the security of the United States and as a

bulwark in protecting peace and democracies throughout the world.

Seventy years ago, democratic nations of Europe and the United States came together to defend the liberty, freedom, and individual rights of their citizens from the threat of a militarized Soviet Union. Now, as then, this defensive alliance serves as a bulwark of stability and the rule of law for the people of its member states. Partnering with our values-based partners serves as a force multiplier for our defensive military capabilities to protect our citizens and advance our interests.

Indeed, the most famous of the articles of incorporation of NATO, article 5, which states that an attack on one member is considered an attack on all, has been invoked only once—only once—when terrorists attacked the United States on September 11 and our NATO allies rallied behind us. The Canadian Air Force was patrolling our skies, and NATO joined us in our collective efforts abroad to hunt down those who had perpetrated the attacks of September 11. We should do nothing in ratification to suggest that we are not committed to article 5.

The U.S. Constitution reigns supreme in all of our actions, so we should not so doubt about our commitment, especially in this time in history. So we are dutybound to carefully consider who we admit into this alliance.

Over the course of its seven-decade history, admission to NATO has been guided by the alliance's open-door policy, as outlined in article 10 of NATO's founding document, and specific benchmarks that every American administration has used since the founding of NATO: Members must have a functioning democratic political system based on a market economy; fair treatment of minority populations; a commitment to resolve conflicts peacefully; an ability and willingness to contribute to NATO military operations; and a commitment to democratic civil-military relations.

Sweden and Finland meet and exceed these benchmarks in every respect. Indeed, the qualifications of these two prosperous, democratic nations are outstanding and will serve to strengthen the NATO alliance. These are two steadfast NATO and U.S. allies with strong military and democratic institutions. They have every reason to participate in collective defense against potential Russian aggression, and NATO has every reason to embrace and welcome them into the alliance without delay.

The people of Sweden and Finland and their governments have shown themselves to be strongly supportive of joining NATO, and in many ways, Finland and Sweden are ideal candidates for NATO membership. Both have large, technologically advanced, and growing militaries that are well-positioned to integrate into NATO. Both have partnered with NATO, contributing to operations in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Iraq. And since Russia's

invasion of Ukraine, they have strengthened their relations with NATO even further. They have been engaging in dialogue and consultations. They have been exchanging information, and they have been coordinating training and exercises.

In fact, given geography and history, Finland and Sweden have long equipped their militaries and prepared their societies for the prospect of Russian aggression. Their participation in NATO would reduce the burden on the United States and the whole military alliance. Finland already spends more than 2 percent of its GDP on its defense budget, and Sweden has repeatedly publicly committed to reaching that target as soon as possible. On top of all of this, these are two nations that are models of good governance—two nations that respect and promote human rights.

With just a few detractors, I am pleased that there will be broad bipartisan support for admitting Sweden and Finland into NATO, but let me speak to those few detractors.

Some critics say they don't want us to subsidize these wealthy European nations' security, but, of course, that is not the case. They meet or will soon meet the 2-percent threshold for military spending. We can count on these nations to pull their own weight. If anything, welcoming Finland and Sweden to NATO will reduce the burden on the United States. There is a tremendous urgency and a strong case for inviting these countries, and we must act now.

For those who say that expanding NATO provokes Russia, I would say, after the decades of neutrality that Finland and Sweden have had, they have been provoked by Russia's aggressions in Ukraine to seek NATO membership.

Should we let ruthless autocrats threaten the security of democratic nations and American allies or let them think they can launch ground invasions against peaceful neighbors without consequences? No.

Should we let the fears of an irrational dictator guide U.S. foreign policy? No.

Should we appease a brutal butcher like Putin? No.

The European public says no; the American public says no; and I hope the U.S. Senate says no as well.

So, today, I urge my colleagues to vote yes—yes to providing advice and consent; yes to supporting these historic treaties; yes to welcoming Finland and Sweden—steadfast, loyal allies and beacons of democracy—to NATO; yes to a Europe that is secure and prosperous.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4723

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, in the month since the Supreme Court struck down *Roe v. Wade*, the assault on reproductive rights by anti-choice MAGA

Republicans—well, it has been relentless.

We have seen and heard the horror stories of women in States that have outlawed abortion. We have seen women and even young girls—children as young as 10—who were raped and unable to get an abortion in their own States. We have seen examples of States looking to restrict—restrict—a woman's ability to travel to other States—restrict a woman's ability to travel to other States—to get the medical care, the often lifesaving care, they desperately need. In fact, this is an issue that Republicans in this Chamber objected to when Democrats brought up a bill to guarantee the fundamental right of women to travel in this country in order to seek care.

MAGA Republicans—oh, wait. They want to strip women of their freedoms, and they want to strip women of their ability to choose what happens to their own bodies. If MAGA extremists have their way in Congress, they will enact a rigid—a rigid—nationwide abortion ban which will threaten women and their doctors with jail time.

Look at what is already happening: Anti-choice States are working to stop women from going to pro-choice States to seek care, and now they are even going after the doctors—after the doctors—in those States, who are simply doing their jobs by taking care of their patients.

This is utterly and completely outrageous. We cannot allow this to happen. That is why Senators MURRAY, PADILLA, LUJÁN, and I introduced legislation to protect doctors in States like Nevada—where abortion remains legal—from facing prosecution by anti-choice States.

Let me be clear. No doctor should ever be jailed for providing women with the reproductive and often lifesaving care they need wherever—wherever—those women are from.

Our bill, the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act, would do exactly what is in the name. It would let doctors—medical professionals—provide reproductive care in States like Nevada where abortion is legal, without fear of prosecution or fear of jail time.

Our bill would empower the Department of Justice to protect women and their doctors in pro-choice States from anti-choice States' attempts to prosecute them. This means that if a woman from Texas travels to my State of Nevada, a pro-choice State, the Nevada doctor she sees cannot—cannot—be prosecuted under Texas's extreme abortion ban.

We need to pass this now, without delay and without objections, because we must protect women, and we must protect their doctors. We must pass the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Let Doc-

tors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act.

I am honored to be here with the Senator from Nevada, Senator ROSEN. She is one of the sponsors of this bill, along with Senator MURRAY and Senator PADILLA, who is also here, and Senator BEN RAY LUJÁN and myself in addition to over 20 of our colleagues.

We must pass this bill today. Almost 6 weeks ago—that is all the time it has been. It seems like it has been a lot longer. It has been only 6 weeks since the Supreme Court issued a rule shredding nearly five decades of precedent of protecting a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions.

Now, because of that decision to shred 50 years of precedent, women are at the mercy of State laws or new State laws or Governors. They literally ran to the State capitols—a number of legislators—to see who could get there first to introduce and pass the most extreme bill. Literally, women are at the mercy of State laws that are a patchwork across the country and that, in many cases, leave them with fewer rights than their mothers or their grandmothers had.

This is in spite of what the American people want, as 70 to 80 percent of Americans believe that it is a decision that should be made by a woman and her doctor and not by politicians—not by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They don't want them making their decisions for them. They want to make their decisions with their doctors.

As if it were not proof enough, after having come here every single week since the Dobbs decision was issued to remind people of where the actual public is out there, look at what happened last night. We heard the majority loud and clear in the Sunflower State of Kansas. The people of Kansas, in a record turnout—doubling the number of Kansans who voted in the last midterm election—voted 59 to 41 percent to protect reproductive freedom. That is more than 530,000 Kansans who showed up at an odd election time. In the middle of the summer, on a hot day in August, they showed up to protect women's rights. For context, fewer than 460,000 Kansans even cast a ballot in the 2018 primary. That is what we are dealing with; yet we now have 530,000 who showed up to vote on one side to say: A woman's right should be protected in their State.

This is a wake-up call to my colleagues who have been resisting action when it comes to allowing women to travel, when it comes to allowing women to be able to make a choice about even contraception, when it comes to, in this bill, letting doctors provide reproductive healthcare.

This doesn't come down to red States or blue States, my friends. People across the country, as I have argued vociferously before—and now I have my proof point—whether they be Independents, Democrats, or moderate Republicans, when they show up, women's

rights are protected. And guess what. They are showing up.

Since this decision came down, I have come to the floor of the Senate again and again with my colleagues to push for commonsense bills to protect women in this post-Roe world. We have tried to preserve a woman's right to travel to other States; that was Senator CORTEZ MASTO's bill. We brought a bill to the floor to give women reliable access to family planning services; that was my colleague Senator TINA SMITH's bill. We tried to pass legislation to make sure everyone could access contraception as well as accurate information about contraception.

We thank all our colleagues for their work on these bills, and I want to specifically mention Senator MURRAY for her work. We are not giving up, not when so much is on the line.

Many of the biggest fights for reproductive freedom are happening on State and local levels. Women as well as their doctors are now in the crosshairs. Republican State lawmakers are drafting legislation that would make it a crime to provide abortion care to a patient in another State where it is legal.

Let's get this straight. They would make it a crime, where you can't get an abortion—like that little 10-year-old girl couldn't get an abortion, when she was raped, in her own State. She goes to another State, and now we have legislators in certain States who are trying to make it a crime for her to do that. State legislators in Texas and Arkansas have indicated they are considering these kinds of laws, and the Governor of South Dakota, which shares a border with my State, refused to rule out a similar law.

Doctors in Minnesota, where reproductive rights are firmly protected, could be prosecuted for providing completely legal medical procedures for people in maybe North Dakota or South Dakota or Iowa who come to the great State of Minnesota.

The Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act is a straightforward solution. It protects doctors giving abortion care in States where it is legal and stops extreme attempts to investigate or punish them for doing their job.

Women and the providers who help them are already facing so much uncertainty because of the Dobbs decision. We should all be able to agree that, at the very least, States shouldn't be able to target, punish, or arrest out-of-State doctors who are following their own State laws.

Today, each and every one of my colleagues has the opportunity to make clear where they stand. They did that in Kansas last night; they were able to vote. Now, let's have a real vote on this—not stop the vote, actually get it done.

I see my friend Senator BLUMENTHAL, who has been such a leader on this issue, out of the State of Connecticut is here as well as Senator PADILLA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague and friend from the great State of Minnesota for being such a steadfast champion of this issue over so many years and such an articulate and eloquent spokesman.

I am proud to join her and other colleagues, as we have done, week after week since the Dobbs decision, trying to protect a woman's right to decide when and whether to have children, a woman's basic control over her own body, a woman's freedom that the Dobbs decision stripped away and put in the hands of politicians.

The politicians in robes on the Supreme Court, in effect, took those rights away from the women of America, after 50 years of precedent and after everyone thought these rights were absolutely secure.

When I first introduced the Women's Health Protection Act in 2013, the idea that *Roe v. Wade* would be overruled was absolutely unimaginable. We were trying to fight the disruption of rights piece by piece through State laws that required admitting privileges or width of hallways or waiting times or other kinds of restrictions that constituted an unconstitutional burden on women's rights.

Now, we are in the post-Roe world where the unthinkable has become real. The unimaginable is with us right now, and worse is to come.

The hit list of this Supreme Court includes contraception, marriage equality, the basic right to privacy that is enshrined in the Constitution, the right to be let alone from government interference.

So my Republican colleagues who think we are being alarmists, the unthinkable is with us right now. And we need to provide assurance and certainty to the women of America that they can travel to seek abortion services; that family planning options will be available to them; that contraception rights will be secure. And each time we have come to the floor to seek that recognition of basic rights, the Republicans have blocked us.

So now we are here on a measure called let doctors provide reproductive healthcare—Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care.

There is a really cruel irony to this effort. The doctors and nurses and healthcare providers who were our heroes and remain our heroes—even more so now—during the pandemic and afterward, can be prosecuted criminally for trying to save a woman's life. An abortion that is necessary to that woman's life may be the mission of a doctor who then can be prosecuted criminally.

Now, in Connecticut, we have said—our legislature has made it absolutely clear that nobody in Connecticut is going to be prosecuted, no law enforcement official in Connecticut is going to cooperate with Texas or any other States that criminalize abortion serv-

ices, no evidence from Connecticut is going to be made available to an overly zealous or aggressive prosecutor hell-bent on going after a doctor or a healthcare provider or a woman who seeks abortion services, but Connecticut is the exception. Its safe harbor makes it unusual, not common.

So we need a national law, Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act, that protects the healthcare givers and providers of our Nation to do their job. The Hippocratic oath is, for them, something that goes as deep as our oath of office for us. We are sworn to uphold the Constitution; they, in effect, take an oath to save lives. That is their job, and their lives should not be in jeopardy, nor should their livelihood, simply because they are doing their job.

We have seen, time and time again, that this Supreme Court has no respect for precedent. We have seen State legislators who have no respect for reproductive rights and healthcare. We cannot rely on false reassurances made by Republican colleagues here or anyone around the country because history has already shown us that this Supreme Court has on its hit list these fundamental rights and expanding the restrictions on them.

So I ask my colleagues to join us in unanimous consent for this measure. That motion will be made shortly. I hope that we can join in ensuring that individuals have access to quality healthcare regardless of their ZIP Code, no matter where they live. The women of America deserve this basic right, and the healthcare providers who enable them to protect themselves and who save lives deserve the assurance that they are not going to be the target of a prosecutor hell-bent on making a name for himself or a State legislature seeking to make political points at the expense of a healthcare provider.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, colleagues, on January 24, just 5½ weeks ago, the Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade* just weeks after Republicans in this Chamber blocked our push to codify the right to an abortion into Federal law.

So since January 24, Democrats have been fighting to ensure that abortion care remains accessible. We pushed to pass a bill that would protect the fundamental right to travel to States where abortion is still legal; Republicans blocked it. We pushed to pass a commonsense bill to expand access to family planning services; Republicans blocked that one too. We pushed to codify the right to contraception; Republicans blocked it. At every turn, Republicans have taken extreme and out-of-touch positions by blocking these commonsense bills.

So today Democrats are standing up to protect doctors, nurses, and other healthcare professionals who are increasingly under attack just for doing

their jobs and providing legal abortions.

Colleagues, I am proud to join Senator MURRAY and our colleagues in this effort to pass the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act to ensure doctors can provide the reproductive healthcare that women need. Abortion access, after all, is essential healthcare.

Now, I have seen firsthand the incredible work that providers in California do to provide critical reproductive care. Most recently, I have visited a Planned Parenthood clinic in Los Angeles. We are already seeing a chilling effect among healthcare providers driven by the uncertainty of their legal liability—like the alarming lawsuit that was filed against the provider in Indiana who legally helped a 10-year-old rape victim terminate her unwanted pregnancy. So we must make it clear for healthcare providers that abortion restrictions cannot be allowed to reach beyond the borders of anti-abortion States.

The decision of whether or not to have a child is one of the most personal decisions that someone can make—for the students who choose to finish high school before starting a family, for the survivors of sexual assault whose abortion reaffirms the right to choose for their own bodies, for the parents who desperately wanted a child only to learn devastating news about dangerous health risks, for patients whose lives were saved by an abortion because abortion is often critical medical care. Access to abortion should not be dictated by politicians and lawyers.

California and many other States across the country refuse to turn the clock back to an era when abortions were outlawed and dangerous. And, as we saw last night in Kansas, the majority of Kansas voters—in fact, the majority of Americans—agree that women should have access to abortion care.

So we must pass the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Healthcare Act to protect the courageous women and men delivering essential medical care to those who need it.

While Republicans continue to block our efforts to protect reproductive rights, Democrats won't back down. In the face of these unending attacks on reproductive freedom, we will not give up the fight to protect a woman's right to safe abortion access.

I yield the floor.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to start by recognizing the overwhelming victory for the right to abortion in Kansas last night. Since the day the Supreme Court struck down the right to abortion and upended the lives of women across the country, the American people have been using their voices to speak out against Republicans' extreme bans.

And now, for the first time since the Dobbs decision, they have had the chance to speak with their votes, and

they sent a message loud and clear: People do not want their fundamental rights stripped away. They will not forget Republicans' cruelty in dragging us back half a century, and when abortion is at stake, they are not going to stay on the sidelines.

Last night, the people of Kansas sent a message as clear as any I have ever seen in politics. Now, today, we are going to see if Republicans are finally getting that message or if they are going to continue to ignore the American people, because Democrats are here today with legislation to protect doctors providing legal abortion care and make sure they can do their jobs, practice medicine, and save lives without the threat of legal action.

I really can't believe that we need this bill at all. We are talking about doctors who are following the law and simply want to provide care to their patients. It is not enough for Republicans that their cruel abortion bans have meant appointments that have been canceled; prescriptions that have been denied; doctors who have been forced to wait until patients got sicker, to wait until women are actually at death's door before they can provide lifesaving care.

Nope, they are going to go further than that. Now they are coming after doctors providing legal abortion care too. I really can't emphasize that enough. These doctors are following the law and are still facing legal threats and harassment.

Right now, in Indiana, a doctor is being investigated after providing an abortion for a 10-year-old who was raped. Think about that. A doctor is being investigated after doing their job, after simply providing healthcare—care that can be lifesaving, care that was entirely legal in their State, care that, up until the Republicans' far-right Supreme Court overturned Roe, was legal across the country.

The fact that Dr. Bernard is being investigated after just doing her job and helping her patient is chilling.

I want to be very clear. While Dr. Bernard's story may be in headlines across the country, she is not the only doctor facing threats, and she will not be the last. At this very moment, Republican State lawmakers are drafting legislation that would make it a crime to provide abortion care to a resident even in another State where it is legal.

From talking with doctors back home in Washington, I can tell you, they are following this closely and they are worried. I have heard from providers back in Spokane and across Washington State who are worried that they could face lawsuits that threaten their practices and their livelihoods just for doing their jobs, just for providing care that patients need—care that is, once again, completely legal in my State.

So Democrats are here today standing up for doctors. We have been drafting a bill of our own, the Let Doctors

Provide Reproductive Healthcare Act, and we are proud that Dr. Bernard herself supports this bill.

I want to thank my colleagues Senator ROSEN from Nevada, Senator LUJÁN from New Mexico, and Senator PADILLA from California for their partnership and critical work on this bill, as well as my colleague Representative SCHRIER from my home State of Washington, who is leading the legislation in the House.

This is another simple bill to address a threat we know is far too real. The Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Healthcare Act will protect doctors providing legal abortion care and make sure that they can practice medicine and save lives without fear of legal threats and intimidation. It will make clear that the attacks we have seen on doctors are unacceptable; that politicians should not be harassing or scaring or investigating or threatening or punishing doctors for providing care that is perfectly legal, that patients want, and that, in many cases, is even necessary to save lives.

Democrats are going to try to pass this bill right now because we believe no doctor should be punished for caring for patients and providing legal abortion care. And if Republicans who have claimed they don't want to punish doctors actually mean it, if those words are more than just an empty talking point, more than another broken promise, they will stay out of the way and let us get this done today.

But if they don't—if they block us like they blocked the legislation to protect the right to travel across State lines for an abortion, or like they blocked the legislation to expand family planning services, or like they blocked legislation to protect the right to contraceptives—their obstruction will continue to speak louder than any of their hollow claims about actually caring for patients or families or women.

And even if they stop us from getting this bill done today, they are not going to stop us from continuing to put them on the record and hold them accountable for their positions. They are not going to stop us from doing everything we can to protect the rights and the people they are putting in grave danger. And they are going to have to answer to the people they represent—to patients, to providers, to families—whose lives they are turning upside down.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 4723 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, many

Americans are not going to see eye to eye on the issue of abortion. I am glad to see that the Supreme Court did what it did and returned that decision to the people, to the State legislatures. Currently, Indiana is debating that issue.

This bill denies State legislators the right to make laws protecting life in their own States. The bill appears to be dealing with traveling freely across the Nation to get an abortion, but a literal reading of the text proves the true intent of the bill. It is, I think, a backdoor into trying to upend what should be neighboring State legislatures' responsibility. It should be the people in their State that make the decision.

Let's look at section 3(a)(3) of the bill, stating "no individual, entity, or State may restrict . . . a health care provider or any individual entity from providing or assisting a health care provider with reproductive health care services for an individual who does not reside"—who does not reside—"in the State in which the services are to be provided."

Sections 3(a)(1) and 3(a)(2) of the bill specifically include the phrase "lawful in the State." Why is that omitted from the previous clause? I think it is because this bill is an attempt to undermine State laws that protect life by allowing abortions for anyone who crosses State lines and is not a resident of that State.

Not to belabor it, I want to read it one more time, slowly. Once again, this bill reads:

No individual, entity, or State may prevent, restrict, impede, or disadvantage . . . any individual from providing or assisting reproductive health care services for an individual who does not reside in the State.

Senator MURRAY did not mention that it also gives the Department of Justice \$40 million in grant funding to help people sue States that enact policies to protect life. The Department of Health and Human Services is given another \$40 million in funding for any eligible center at Secretary Becerra's discretion. This funding is not protected by the Hyde amendment.

We should not spend \$80 million to undermine State laws on life or impose a legislative backdoor for abortion on demand across the Nation. For this reason, I oppose this bill, and I do object to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, we have now seen time and again, over the last few weeks, that when it comes to protecting rights and providing healthcare for women and patients and families, Republicans' promises are empty and their positions are extreme.

Democrats just offered a bill to protect the rights of providers to be able to provide abortions in legal States. Democrats recently offered a bill to protect the right to travel across State lines to get an abortion. They blocked it. We offered a bill to expand our Nation's longstanding Family Planning

Program. They blocked that. We offered a bill to protect the right to contraceptives, and they blocked that too. Today, again, we offered a bill simply to protect doctors performing legal abortions, and they blocked that too.

Each one of these bills was incredibly straightforward. Each one of these is common sense. Each time, Republicans have stood in the way of basic protections of Americans' reproductive freedoms.

Democrats are not giving up, and, as we saw last night, the American people are not either. We are going to fight for the right to an abortion. We are going to fight for doctors who are doing their jobs and doing what is best for their patients. We are going to fight for women making their own decisions about their own bodies, their families, and their futures.

And we are going to make sure everyone knows and no one forgets exactly who is standing in the way, exactly where Republicans stand in this fight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no time is yielded, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Ohio.

#### UKRAINE

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I am on the floor today with Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN from New Hampshire to join in a colloquy regarding what is happening in Ukraine. This is the 20th time in so many weeks that I have come to the floor to talk about the illegal, unprovoked, and brutal invasion of Ukraine by Russia.

Today, I look forward to being with my colleague Senator SHAHEEN, a member of the Ukraine Caucus and someone with whom I have traveled to Ukraine and also to the border of Ukraine and Poland to meet with the refugees.

Senator SHAHEEN is going to talk, I think, a little about how we got to where we are and what we do going forward. I was also recently made aware of the fact that we are going to take up the NATO ratification vote today. And this is to have the United States approve the addition of Sweden and Finland to the NATO alliance. This is great for the alliance. It is great for the United States. And I believe it is also—otherwise, they wouldn't be interested—very good for the people of Finland and Sweden.

They add a lot to the NATO alliance. They are militarily and economically in a position to be valuable contributors. They also, in the case of Finland, share the largest land border with Russia of any country. They have understandable concerns with what they see happening in Ukraine.

I just believe it is very much in our national security interests and the interests of people I represent to have, in addition, even further strengthening of the NATO alliance through the addition of these two partners.

Vladimir Putin thought he was going to split NATO apart when he began his

invasion of Ukraine, I believe. And today, he is finding just the opposite has happened. NATO has come together in ways we have never seen. And we now have, again, the addition of two very strong members of NATO who are longtime allies of the United States and will add significantly to the NATO alliance.

With regard to Ukraine, let's start with a little history. Ukrainians have faced adversity from Russia for hundreds of years. This is not new to them. Russia's oppression of Ukraine is not a 21st century issue. For 300 years, under the brutal rule of the Russian czars, Ukrainians were subjected to repeated efforts to stamp out their language, their culture, and their identity.

In January of 1918, Ukrainians got their first taste of national freedom. While Russia was dealing with the chaos of the Bolshevik Revolution, Ukraine declared its independence from the Russian Empire. Unfortunately, this freedom was short-lived. Just a few years later, the Bolsheviks conquered Ukraine and subsumed it into the Soviet Union.

As an unwilling member of the Soviet Empire, Ukrainians suffered horrific atrocities at the hands of their Soviet overlords. In 1932 and again in 1933, the Stalinist regime confiscated grain harvests across Ukraine and imposed a premeditated manmade famine against the people of Ukraine. This horrific atrocity is known as the Holodomor. Millions of men, women, and children were starved to death in a deliberate effort to break the Ukrainian nation's resistance to communist occupation. Stalin even ordered the borders of the country to be sealed to prevent anyone from escaping this manmade starvation and to prevent the delivery of any international food aid.

In 2018, Senator DURBIN and I introduced a resolution to commemorate the 85th anniversary of the Holodomor and to recognize the Commission on the Ukraine Famine's findings that the Holodomor was a genocide—no question.

I am grateful to Senator SHAHEEN, Senator TILLIS, and others who are in the Chamber today for cosponsoring that resolution. It passed in October of 2018 unanimously here in the U.S. Senate.

The Holodomor failed to extinguish the Ukrainian people's identity, as hard as they tried, but it was not the end of the Soviet oppression. In the 1970s, the Soviet leadership imposed a crackdown on Ukrainian intellectuals and those with any sort of leanings toward independence or toward the West. The prisons and gulags became filled with Ukrainian political prisoners as the Soviet Union once again tried to assault Ukrainian identity.

But then, in 1991, after years of oppression, Ukraine finally broke away from its Russian rulers for good. Ukraine declared its independence on August 24 that year, and in December, the declaration was confirmed by a referendum in which over 90 percent of