

for applied across the board. It would have frozen spending on Social Security, Medicare, defense, and much more.

Nothing any Republican has proposed today comes close to the broad-based spending cuts advocated by then-Senator Biden. What Republicans have put forward likely wouldn't go far enough for the 1984 Joe Biden. Today, our debt, our deficits, and our interest costs are all on a far bleaker path than they were in 1984. Yet President Biden refuses to entertain even modest spending cuts. That should be unacceptable and is unacceptable to most Americans.

We can't continue to ignore our current fiscal trajectory. We must get our fiscal house in order. Failure to act puts children born today in a position that they will never be able to recover from financially. This Congress must come together to fix our broken budget system and return to regular order. As the ranking member of the Senate's Budget Committee, I stand ready to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to put us on a more sustainable path.

Unfortunately, the White House doesn't seem to want to address the issues we are facing. The President's budget request continues our Nation on a path to fiscal ruin. Under the administration's budget proposals, public debt as a share of our economy will set a new record in 2027.

We owe it to the Nation's young people to leave them a country that is on solid financial ground. We cannot ask the generation of tomorrow to pay for the gluttony of today.

Here are the words of then-Senator Biden in 1984: "I, myself, am outraged . . . I hope that all those other Senators who share my outrage will also share my determination to do something" about our unsustainable debt.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

300-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE ILLINOIS NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, "Always ready, always there." That is the motto of the Illinois National Guard. And for 300 years, in times of war and peace, it has lived up to that promise.

As the Illinois National Guard celebrates its 300th anniversary, we thank our citizen soldiers for their service and their sacrifice.

If you want to see the selfless character of the Illinois National Guard, just take a look around the Senate because you will spot my colleague Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH, former Lt. Col. TAMMY DUCKWORTH of the Illinois Air National Guard.

Senator DUCKWORTH almost gave her life when the Black Hawk helicopter she was copiloting was hit by an RPG in Iraq. But it didn't diminish her will to serve our State and our Nation, and I am lucky to have her as my colleague.

The Illinois National Guard traces its history of service to May 9, 1723, when a local militia completed its first exercise in Kaskaskia, IL. Back then, Illinois was still a French territory. Since then, the citizen soldiers of the Illinois National Guard have protected our State and Nation at home and abroad.

When the Mississippi River overflows its banks or when we are faced with other natural disasters, it is the Guard that we call. And its members have served with honor and distinction throughout its history.

During the American Revolution, Illinois' militia members fought under the heroic command of Col. George Rogers Clark to oust the British from Illinois.

Illinois' most famous member of the National Guard was a man named Abraham Lincoln, who served during the Black Hawk war in the 1830s.

During the Mexican-American War, a young Army officer served as assistant quartermaster in the 21st Illinois Infantry Regiment. He went on to lead the Union forces to victory in the Civil War. His name was Ulysses S. Grant.

Later, Illinois' 370th Infantry Regiment earned the distinction of being the only Army unit commanded mainly by African-American officers in World War I, and members of the Illinois Army National Guard served bravely in World War II, the Korean war, Vietnam war, Operation Desert Storm, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

More recently, Illinois National Guard members were activated during the COVID-19 pandemic as the world grappled with that virus; and after the U.S. Capitol was attacked on January 6, National Guard members were dispatched to help restore order.

In the most challenging times, the Illinois National Guard continues to be "Always ready, always there." I am confident they will be for many years to come.

This month, their sacrifices are remembered throughout our State; and on behalf of a grateful State and Nation, I want to commend Maj. Gen. Rich Neely, the adjutant general of the Illinois National Guard, and all the men and women of the Illinois National Guard on the occasion of this momentous anniversary.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. President, we have sure learned a lot since the Dobbs decision was handed down.

Roe v. Wade was controversial, but after 15 years, we had reached something of a balance in terms of what was allowed and what wasn't allowed on a national basis. Then came the Dobbs decision and the repeal—overruling—of Roe v. Wade, and for the first time in the history of the United States, a con-

stitutional right which women had enjoyed for 50 years was removed from the law. It never has happened before.

The American people have united together in support of the belief that reproductive rights are a fundamental right and that extremist politicians have no business dictating the healthcare decisions of women and their doctors.

Just a few days ago, Republican lawmakers in two States failed to pass restrictive abortion laws, and they were not blue States—far from it: South Carolina and Nebraska. Cheers actually erupted outside the Nebraska Legislature when the proposed abortion ban failed.

To some, the failure of these abortion bans in Republican-controlled States may be surprising, but if you have been paying attention over the last year since the Dobbs decision was handed down, it is no surprise. In the months since that decision, at least a dozen States have enacted near-total bans on abortion, and the number of horror stories that are emerging from those States is staggering—stories of rape victims as young as 10 years of age being denied healthcare because of restrictive State laws governing abortion; an 11-year-old victim of sex trafficking also denied an abortion under one of these State laws; stories of women being forced to flee their home States to access basic reproductive care service; stories of pregnant women suffering miscarriages, being turned away by doctors until their lives are at risk because these abortion bans are so vague and so poorly written that healthcare providers are afraid to provide lifesaving care until the women are in an extreme situation. And the laws surrounding abortion—and miscarriage management—seem to be changing almost on a weekly basis. So much confusion and chaos.

Now, one of the most striking features of the Dobbs decision itself was the almost complete absence of discussion of one subject. The subject: women. In a 79-page ruling, women received a few paragraphs from Justice Alito on the Supreme Court. This author of the majority opinion defended his disregard for women's lives by arguing it is "hard for anyone"—Justice Alito said, "and in particular, for a court—to assess . . . the effect of the abortion right on society and . . . on the lives of women."

That is from the man who wrote the decision, the Dobbs decision that repealed Roe v. Wade. He said it was kind of difficult to assess the impact it would have on the lives of women. He was sure right about that.

Mr. President, perhaps the Court's conservative majority should have paid closer attention to the briefs filed by medical professionals like the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the American Medical Association, who gave Justice Alito and the majority on the Supreme Court fair warning about what was going to

happen—an immediate healthcare crisis across America. Sadly, their prediction turned out to be true.

Now, last week, as the Presiding Officer will remember, in the Judiciary Committee, we had a historic hearing about the horrific consequences of the Dobbs decision. One of our witnesses, I still remember to this day. It was one of the most compelling pieces of testimony I have ever seen. Her name is Amanda Zurawski. She gave one of the most heartbreaking presentations I had ever heard.

Amanda lives in Texas, you see, one of the first States with a near-total ban on abortion that took effect after Dobbs. She endured 18 months of fertility treatments in a desperate attempt so that she and her husband could become pregnant. When she finally did, her husband was over the moon, so excited and so happy. They named their soon-to-be little girl Willow.

Last August, in the second trimester of her pregnancy, Amanda didn't feel right. She called her doctor, who told her to come in as quickly as possible. After the exam, Amanda and her husband received a heartbreaking diagnosis: Her cervix had dilated prematurely; the loss of her baby was inevitable.

Amanda asked what could be done, what was the right thing to do for the “respectful passing” of her baby and to protect herself so that maybe there would be another attempt and she could become pregnant again.

To her shock, her doctors in Texas told her that there was nothing they could do because of the State's new anti-abortion law—laws that threaten doctors with fines up to \$100,000 and up to 99 years in prison and losing their medical license.

Amanda's doctors tried to find another hospital nearby that could possibly help her. Those hospitals all had the same response: Because of Texas's new anti-abortion law, they refused to do anything to provide care for Amanda.

She told our committee:

People have asked why we didn't get on a plane or in our car to go to a state where the laws aren't so restrictive. But we live in the middle of Texas, and the nearest “sanctuary” state is at least an 8-hour drive. Developing sepsis—which can kill quickly—in a car in the middle of the West Texas desert or 30,000 feet above the ground is a death sentence, and it's not a choice we should have had to even consider. So all we could do was wait.

She waited 3 agonizing days, developing a raging fever and dangerously low blood pressure. Sepsis had set in. Her husband rushed her to the hospital. Several hours later, her daughter arrived as predicted: stillborn. Amanda spent the next 3 days in intensive care in the hospital fighting for her own life. She has spent the last 8 months battling trauma and depression from this experience, as well as the medical fallout from delayed treatment, including complications which may make it difficult for her ever to bear a child.

That is the new law in Texas. It almost killed her.

During last week's hearing, we also heard from Dr. Nisha Verma. She is an OB/GYN. She has chosen to stay in practice in Georgia despite knowing that “Georgia's laws threatened to make [her] a criminal for providing lifesaving care to her patients.”

Dr. Verma told our committee:

Imagine looking someone in the eye and saying: “I have all the skills and the tools to care for you, but our state's politicians have told me I can't [lift a finger.]”

She reminded us that the United States already has the highest maternal mortality rate of any wealthy nation. Restrictive abortion laws, she said, are making pregnancy even more dangerous for American women.

Regrettably, some of our Republican colleagues tried to make last week's hearing about something they called “late-term abortions” and “partial-birth abortions,” both medically inaccurate terms. In their fearmongering, what they neglected to note is that abortions after 21 weeks of pregnancy account for less than 1 percent of abortions in America, according to the Centers for Disease Control.

They also failed to acknowledge that in the very rare instance when abortion happens late in pregnancy, it is generally because a woman's life is in danger or a fatal fetal anomaly has been discovered—or because a woman wasn't able to get the abortion earlier due to restrictive State laws.

And as Dr. Verma correctly noted, hypotheticals of patients seeking an abortion until the moment of birth “does not reflect the reality of abortion . . . It simply doesn't happen,” this doctor said.

For nearly 50 years, abortion opponents said their only goal was to return the right to decide abortion laws to the States. It is now clear that that was not true; dismantling *Roe v. Wade* was always the first step.

The real goal is to systematically strip away access to abortion nationwide, and that is exactly what they are trying to do. For example, many congressional Republicans submitted a brief urging one Federal judge in Texas to issue a nationwide injunction blocking the use of a medication abortion pill, mifepristone, a drug the FDA approved more than 20 years ago, found to be safe and effective—safer than Tylenol.

Congress needs to stop this chaos. The bill, Women's Health Protection Act, will restore the protection of abortion access across the country, consistent with *Roe v. Wade*.

That testimony about what that young mother went through in Texas was an eye-opener. I couldn't help but think of my own daughter and my family and what I would have done if she was in a situation where she faced death and had to be sicker for the doctors to finally act and save her life.

She waited 3 days in that intensive care unit to finally survive and go on

with her life, but her life may never be the same. I pray that she will have an opportunity to have another child someday.

But it gets down to the bottom line, Mr. President—and I think you understand as well as I do. I am an attorney; I am not a doctor. And if I am asked to make a decision about something as complicated as what to do with a 10-year-old who happens to have been a victim of rape and pregnant, I am going to think twice and ask people who know what to do for a living, medically trained people, who can make the right decision for the people who are involved in that process.

To sit here in State after State and have these decisions being made—for instance, to say you can't have an abortion anytime after 6 weeks of a pregnancy—I know enough about that experience from my own family experience that many women will never know the answer to that question in the first 6 weeks, and yet the law is being written by politicians and legislators who think they know better. Many of them couldn't consider passing any courses in medical school, but they are going to write the medical law now. In fact, insert into the examination room and emergency room State-elected officials who are going to be hovering over those doctors and threatening them with hundred-thousand-dollar fines and 99 years in prison if they guess wrong.

What have we come to in this country? I think the American people understand how desperate we are at this point with the chaos that we face. I can only hope that the election will make a difference. I think it will. I really sense that there is a realignment in this country. The women, in particular, but many families are deciding that the Republicans have just gone too far with the Dobbs decision. And what is happening across this country is not only chaotic, it is immoral. It is immoral to have a young woman like Amanda face death when she was trying to do everything possible to have a baby and be a mother and then have the terrible diagnosis which told her her child was not going to live. That is where we are today.

I hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee can continue to bring this item before the American people so they can hear clearly what we face after the Dobbs decision by the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, years ago, we realized the government's failure to keep up with the amount of classified information is outdated; it is insufficient; and it is costly.

It is important to improve our broken classification system to reduce costs, eliminate years of backlog, and create a more efficient system. But I now recognize there is another reason to do this beyond just the efficiency of good government. We now know, also, it is making our country more vulnerable.

The disclosure of classified information threatens our country's security, diminishes the safety of our military, and damages our relationships with our allies.

We are so overwhelmed protecting outdated documents that we have failed to meet the basic purpose of our classification system: protect classified information from bad actors.

In the past year, our Nation experienced a number of harmful incidents relating to how classified information has been handled. Last year, we learned that classified information was improperly in the possession of the President, the former President, and the former Vice President.

Last month, our Nation became aware of a number of documents allegedly leaked by a 21-year-old Air National Guardsman trying to impress his video game buddies.

Regarding the latest leaks and the constant reporting streaming from them, I am mystified that such a person could have such broad access to some of our Nation's most sensitive information.

The alleged leaker had a known history of threatening violence and a record that did not permit him to obtain a gun. How could he be trusted with a top security clearance?

To protect the security of the United States, it is necessary for Congress to understand how these episodes happened, ascertain the damage that has been inflicted, and work to reduce the likelihood of them ever happening again.

We must also overhaul how records are handled and who has access to them. I want to highlight the enormous amount of classified information that is already in the government's possession. In this digital era, the Federal Government is classifying more information than our current analog declassification efforts can meet.

We are increasingly finding that information which should no longer be classified, including historical records subject to mandatory declassification, remain classified because the system is just simply overwhelmed.

This comes at a cost of good governance: American taxpayers spend \$18 billion a year—\$18 billion a year—on this broken system, and it prevents transparency, costly and not good government, citizens without information.

When there are no compelling national security reasons to justify

records remaining classified, public trust in government is undermined.

Senator WYDEN, the Senator from Oregon, and I have attempted to address this growing problem by introducing the Declassification Reform Act in the previous two Congresses.

Following the recommendations of the Public Interest Declassification Board, we sought to designate the Director of National Intelligence as the official responsible to oversee an intelligence community-wide reform so that we don't fall further and further and further behind.

The intelligence community recognizes the urgency of reforming the classification system. However, it remains a question of who is in charge of this process. An executive agent is necessary. The Declassification Reform Act establishes a working fund for Agencies to utilize.

Our legislation doesn't resolve every problem associated with how government classifies and declassifies information. Too much information is classified, and administrations from both parties have allowed political considerations to interfere in the declassification process. But when records no longer require classification, neither disagreements about national security nor politics are to blame. It is an out-of-date system that is in need of leadership—leadership to reform it.

A modernized declassification system will help eliminate years of backlog and create more efficiency and greater transparency.

Modernizing our system would also apply to the process of tracking records that are supposed to remain classified so that we can better keep them secure, which is now the top priority for why we must immediately address this issue.

We live in a very dangerous world. And information that is classified and should be classified should not be shared with others. And yet we saw that happen just last month. Sensitive information that must remain classified must be protected from carelessness or maliciousness. Yet the records that no longer need to remain classified should be made available in a timely fashion.

I serve on the Senate Intelligence Committee. I look forward to introducing legislation with Senator WARNER as chairman, Senator CORNYN and Senator WYDEN, other members of that committee, to introduce legislation in the coming days to further address this issue.

I also welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues, both on the committee and in this Chamber, to advance this debate and reach solutions to improve an out-of-date declassification system and better protect our national security, the challenges we face in this country and around the world. Now is not the time for us to look the other way. We can do better, and we need to head down that path quickly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SOLAR TARIFFS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the CRA that we will be voting on soon. This vote presents a pretty simple choice: Do you stand with American manufacturers and American workers or do you stand with China and do you stand with our continuing to lose our industrial base?

I fought my whole career for fair trade. One of my first and proudest votes was against the North American Free Trade Agreement, as a Member of the House. We saw what that agreement did to Vermont, did to Ohio, and did to Kansas—and Senator MORAN just spoke. We saw what NAFTA did.

These trade fights are not a new fight. Some years ago—about 20 years ago—when I was a Member of the House, I wrote a book called "Myths of Free Trade." The book wasn't exactly a bestseller. I can live with that. But telling the truth on trade has not been popular in this town—by Presidents of both parties, majorities in Congress, and corporate leaders and CEOs who were lobbying Congress.

Essentially, these trade agreements sold out American workers. These trade agreements were signed or, at least, negotiated by American Presidents and voted for by far too many Members of Congress, lobbied by the most powerful interest groups in Washington.

I remember that during NAFTA—there were two things during NAFTA, particularly. One was that someone said that there were more corporate jets at National Airport than they had ever seen, because CEOs were all flying in to push for NAFTA—to get us to vote for NAFTA—because it was more money in their pockets because it was fewer dollars in workers' pockets. The other thing I remember was one of the—this was a two-party thing. Democrats were pretty bad. Republicans were actually slightly worse. But both parties were guilty, and Presidents from both parties—from Trump and all the way back to Clinton, since I came here.

One of the Democratic leaders on this issue in the House said to me: You know, I hate these congressional recesses because when our Members go home and go to county fairs and start meeting with people, they decide that they don't think NAFTA is such a great idea.

So every time we went home, this guy, who was a Member of Congress who was pushing for NAFTA, had more work to do because the more the public heard from workers—the more that Congressman heard from workers and