

week, and, as a result, the Supreme Court will take up the issue of abortion again, twice in less than 1 year. This lawsuit against mifepristone is only the latest example of the never-ending chaos and confusion women and medical professionals have experienced since the Supreme Court threw out *Roe v. Wade*.

All across America, activist judges and rightwing lawmakers are working hand in hand to impose increasingly onerous restrictions on reproductive care, and they won't stop until abortion is banned in every form in every part of the country. It is not about each State deciding it at all.

Of course, there is only one reason this relentless assault has accelerated: the Dobbs decision. By erasing a constitutional right that had been on the books for 50 years, the rightwing majority opened the floodgates for new laws and new rulings and even criminalizing abortion. And the laws seem to be changing almost every week. Doctors have no idea if the care they provide today will be legal tomorrow.

Recently, Florida decided that they would not allow pregnancies to be terminated after 6 weeks of pregnancy. It is just a fact of life—and every person knows it—that it usually takes much more than 6 weeks for a woman to be certain that she is pregnant.

So instead of ending the ban on abortion, the Dobbs decision has really opened a different debate: How far will we let this brand of political radicalism go?

Look at how these attacks on reproductive healthcare have escalated. First, the Supreme Court overturned decades of legal precedent to revoke a constitutional right. That is the first time it has ever happened in the history of the Supreme Court, revoking an established constitutional right.

Now, less than a year later, one judge in Texas has decided to escalate the situation. He wants to take drug approval decisions out of the hands of doctors and scientific experts at the FDA and violate decades of congressional and Agency precedent.

So, naturally, the American people are wondering: What is next? How far will the rightwing extremists go in destabilizing our rights and the rule of law? What is next? Birth control? Vaccines? Medicine for HIV/AIDS?

It is a genuine question. Just ask healthcare providers in Illinois who are wondering if they are going to face criminal charges for providing vital and potentially lifesaving care.

Let me tell you about one of them. Her name is Andrea Gallegos. She operates a clinic in Carbondale. She opened her clinic last October after the Dobbs decision. She wanted to provide resources to women traveling from other States. Today, roughly 95 percent of her patients travel from outside of Illinois.

She tells us that the recent rulings on mifepristone have created chaos. Every day, she receives calls from ter-

rified patients who are wondering if they will even be able to receive care. The question she hears the most is: "Will someone come after me?" when I ask for assistance? And while Andrea tries her best to reassure her patients, the truth is, she is even struggling to understand the state of the law in America. She says the chaos and confusion are "putting pregnant [women] even more at risk."

Andrea and her patients are living with the real-world consequences of anti-choice radicalism, and it shows how the Dobbs opinion is entirely detached from reality.

Andrea said:

The Dobbs decision did not resolve any controversy . . . it has forced pregnant [women] to flee their home[s] . . . for health care. . . . It has forced citizens of this country to become medical refugees [in their own] states. . . . [And it has] forced health care providers to put their patients in dangerous, potentially life-threatening situations.

She said:

The Dobbs decision goes against what we . . . stand for in America . . . a person's fundamental right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

These are the words of a healthcare professional trying to operate within the law and wondering, as it changes by the week, if Dobbs returned the question of abortion back to the States, what about my State? What about their elected leaders? Our voters spoke, and our leaders took action to reflect their will to strengthen access to abortion. So why does one judge in Amarillo, TX, have the last word when it comes to medical abortions in my State or any other State?

This war on women's healthcare has gone too far. That is why the Senate needs to do its job: Stop the chaos and return and establish the "Roe v. Wade" woman's right to choose once and for all by passing the Women's Health Protection Act.

In the meantime, here is what Senate Democrats are doing. I joined 49 of my Senate colleagues in filing an amicus brief to the Supreme Court urging them to immediately overturn the Amarillo decision banning and restricting access to mifepristone.

Additionally, in the coming weeks, the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, will hold a hearing on the state of abortion rights. This will be a followup to the hearing we held last year immediately after the Dobbs decision.

We have learned what happens when you revoke a constitutional right from the American people. We can never let this happen again. We need to respect the rights of women to make this choice, to make their own healthcare decisions, and to do it in consultation with medical professionals—doctors and medical professionals who are not living in fear that they are going to be imprisoned by making the right medical decision. And Democrats won't rest until we have restored access to these constitutional rights nationwide.

I yield the floor.

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

SENATOR FEINSTEIN

Mr. CORNYN. Well, Mr. President, we are now back in session after a busy 2-week recess where I know many of us were traveling in our States or parts of the world and attending to our duties here in the Senate in various capacities. But now we are back here in Washington, DC, and it appears to me that we have a whole lot we need to do before the Fourth of July recess.

But before we begin the day-to-day task of legislating, the majority leader, it is reported, is expected to ask for some personnel changes in the Senate.

Senator FEINSTEIN, our colleague from California, has been out for a couple of months due to some health issues—not an uncommon occurrence here in the Senate, and I know the entire Senate joins me in wishing her a quick recovery and a speedy return here to the Senate.

But given the tight margins in this Chamber, her absence has created some complications for Senator SCHUMER within the Senate Judiciary Committee on which I serve.

Without her vote, our Democratic colleagues are simply unable to advance the most controversial and partisan judicial nominees whom the President has selected.

Given the lack of Republican support, these partisan nominees simply cannot move to the Senate floor for a vote. To get around the issue, Senator SCHUMER has come up with a unique proposal. He wants to temporarily replace Senator FEINSTEIN on the Judiciary Committee.

The idea is to remove her from the committee for an unspecified period of time, name a replacement, and then reinstate Senator FEINSTEIN when she returns. This is, it turns out, unprecedented. Over the years, Senators from both sides, as I indicated a moment ago, have needed time away due to various health issues. Never, not once, have we allowed temporary substitutes on committees, and now is not the time to start.

Republicans are not going to break this precedent in order to bail out Senator SCHUMER or the Biden administration's most controversial nominees. Yesterday evening, the majority leader said he spoke with Senator FEINSTEIN, and she hopes she will be back soon. We all hope that she comes back soon.

But it is another reason not to go along with Senator SCHUMER's ploy for temporary appointment of a member of the Judiciary Committee. Senator FEINSTEIN has been a mainstay of this body for more than three decades, and I hope to see her back in these Halls soon.

But until then, President Biden's most controversial partisan judicial nominees will have to wait.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. President, as I said, this Chamber has a lot to do—the 100 of us who

serve in this Chamber. One of the most critical tasks we have is to avoid a debt crisis. Back in January, the United States hit its debt limit, and the U.S. Treasury Department has begun using what they call extraordinary measures to prevent the government from defaulting on its debt.

Since then, we have been operating, literally, on borrowed time. We don't know exactly when those measures will be exhausted. It depends, in part, upon tax returns or tax revenue being generated, and that can be a little bit unpredictable. But experts have said that it could occur as soon as June, which is a little less than 2 months away.

As we know, nothing happens very quickly here in the Senate. It takes time to negotiate, to write, debate, and pass legislation; meaning, it is time to get serious about preventing a fiscal crisis. From the get-go, President Biden drew outrageous red lines and ruled out any negotiations over spending reforms.

Clearly, that was not a realistic nor a responsible position to take. President Biden has signed partisan spending bills totaling \$2.7 trillion just in the last year or so alone, and now he says it is up to the Republicans in the House to deal with the debt ceiling, and he is not going to negotiate. That is not a responsible position for the President of the United States to take.

Moreover, the national debt is now \$31.6 trillion and counting. Congress cannot just raise the debt limit and continue to borrow and spend like there is no tomorrow.

Yes, this is like your child maxing out their credit limit and then asking you or the bank, perhaps, to raise the credit limit without regard to repaying the debt or at least some of the debt that they owe. No responsible actor acts that way, and the President knows it.

So President Biden needs to get off his high horse. He needs to come to the negotiating table, and I am sure Speaker MCCARTHY will more than meet him halfway.

Yes, we all agree, we need to avoid a debt crisis. No one wants the United States to default on its debts, but we also need to enact broader reforms to rein in spending, and that has traditionally been what happens when the debt ceiling is increased.

We can't just slap a bandaid on the problem and call it a day. We can't just continue to indefinitely raise the debt limit and burden more and more of future generations with the responsibility that we ourselves should embrace because it is our responsibility and not those future generations.

It is time for Congress to buckle down and get government spending in check, and this is a prime opportunity to have that debate and those votes. Of course, this is just one piece of the Senate's work to promote financial responsibility. We also need to pass regular appropriations bills on time and through the regular order. Move them

out of committee, across the floor, give Senators a chance to offer amendments, and then vote. That is what we call regular order around here.

Instead, what we have gotten, at least last year, was a \$1.7 trillion bill, I think that was the final pricetag, an omnibus bill, which denied the opportunity for any Member of Congress or the Senate to offer amendments or debate different portions of it, to either add to or reprioritize some of the spending or—Heaven forbid—to cut some of the wasteful spending.

Instead, we were given the choice of an up-or-down vote, and that, of course, is the way the leadership likes it. That is the way Speaker PELOSI and Senator SCHUMER, the Senate majority leader, likes it because it maximizes their authority, while it casts the rest of us who have been independently elected to this body on the sidelines as spectators, only to be called into action once the final vote is called.

Well, unfortunately, Congress hasn't had much of a success record when it comes to regular order for appropriations bills. The Senate and House Appropriations Committees, as we know, are charged with writing 12 separate bills to fund different components of the Federal Government.

They are supposed to pass, as I indicated, both Chambers, the House and the Senate, and then those differences are reconciled and then signed into law before September 30 of every year. But that didn't happen last year, as I said. The Democratic-led Senate did not pass a single regular appropriations bill. And, again, that is not by accident; that is by design.

But it doesn't serve the interest of our constituents; it doesn't serve the interests of rank-and-file Members of the Senate to be relegated to the sidelines like a potted plant; and it doesn't give the American people what they are entitled to, which is the kind of robust debate, prioritization, and, yes, some spending restraint and cuts, particularly in areas where we can all agree that that spending is not a high priority or is, indeed, wasteful.

Instead of that regular order, we saw a temporary continuing resolution, which doesn't help the Pentagon or any other element of the Federal Government actually make plans for a year-long spending appropriation, but rather has to deal with stopgap spending bills, pending this big Omnibus appropriations bill at the end of the year.

And, of course, all of this happens in a rushed fashion, completely out of the public's view. We simply cannot accept this as the new normal. We need to abandon this habit of continuing resolutions and last-minute omnibuses and return to regular ontime appropriations bills.

In order to plan and prepare for the future, Federal Agencies and certainly our military are looking at daunting challenges all across the globe. Whether it is in Europe or in Asia, in North Korea or in the Middle East, we have

daunting national security challenges facing us. And this kind of inappropriate power play, frankly, by the leadership of the House and the Senate we saw demonstrated last December does not serve the interest of our military, our national security, or the public interest.

And it results in big, bloated, spending bills that Congress simply doesn't have the opportunity to parse. Well, we know that it takes time to do that so it shouldn't be put on the back burner until we are approaching the end of the fiscal year, which is coming at the end of September. We need to get that process moving now.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, it is not just financial problems that need to be addressed, there are also big security issues on our plate. In the coming months, we need to pass an annual defense authorization bill to strengthen our military and our security around the world and, hopefully, to maintain the peace.

But we also have big security issues here at home that need to be addressed. As the Presiding Officer has heard me say many times from this position, the border crisis is still raging. Thousands of migrants are crossing the border every single day and completely overwhelming our capacity to respond. It is honestly not a question of capacity, it is really a matter of will, and so far the Biden administration has demonstrated no will to deal with this border crisis of its own making.

Law enforcement, border communities, nonprofits, and local businesses along the border region are feeling the strain. Our immigration system is now so backlogged that some migrants have to wait as long as 10 years before they can even begin immigration court proceedings.

And then we know from the track record of successful claims for asylum that only—let's say generously—85 percent of those cases will not be acknowledged. Only 15 percent will be granted because only 15 percent of that huge backlog of cases that ultimately end up in front of an immigration judge qualify for the very high legal standard for asylum.

Well, over the last couple of years, the administration has shattered every record when it comes to border crossings because there is a welcome mat out and a green light on for anybody and everybody who wants to come to the United States from literally anywhere around the world.

But as bad as the crisis has been the last 2 years, I am afraid the administration is about to break their own very bad record. Title 42, which is a public health law which says we can limit immigration to the United States in the interest of protecting our population against a public health crisis like COVID-19—that title is going to end in less than a month, and the Border Patrol will lose its authority to quickly expel migrants who simply have no legal basis to remain in the United States.