

with criminal records from coming into the country and applying for asylum because under current law—law that the President is bound to administer and enforce—those questions are not brought into the process until that asylum claim is being heard by a judge.

And so it is just another example of the ways in which the bipartisan border bill—the bill that Republicans asked for, demanded Democrats negotiate—would have made this country safer, would have created a more efficient and more secure border. And I am still furious—and heartbroken—that Republicans decided to keep the border a mess because it helps their Presidential candidate politically instead of trying to solve the problem.

As for this specific measure, as I said last time I came to the floor to object, it is already, under current law, a deportable offense if you commit a crime of violence. It is already, under current law, a deportable offense if you commit and are convicted of any crime involving moral turpitude. And, further, non-citizens who are convicted of any aggravated felony, including misdemeanor offenses, are deportable as well.

So this bill is seeking to solve a problem that doesn't exist because current law says, if you commit an assault on a law enforcement officer, you are going to be deported.

So why are we debating this bill if current law already says you can be deported for assaulting a police officer?

I don't know the answer, but what I know is that there is a broader effort underfoot by former President Trump and my Republican colleagues to try to make Americans believe that there is a specific unique threat posed to you by immigrants; that you should fear people that are coming to this country to seek a better life or to flee terror or torture. It is a familiar trope because it was used against my forefathers when they came here from Ireland. It was used against those who came to the United States from prior generations: You should fear the Irish. You should fear the Italians. You should fear the Chinese. Today, it is that you should fear those coming from Central or South America.

But it is just not the truth. I know it is hard to hear for some folks who believe everything they watch on FOX News, but individuals who are first-generation immigrants to this country are less likely to be convicted of violent crimes than individuals who are born in this country.

In 2020, the Trump DOJ sought to prove that false. They actually commissioned research to examine the rate of crime between noncitizens and citizens because they couldn't believe the data because FOX News said that we should fear immigrants.

Here is one of the papers that was commissioned by the Trump DOJ:

[W]e find that undocumented immigrants had substantially lower crime rates than native-born citizens . . . across a range of fel-

ony offenses. Relative to undocumented immigrants, US-born citizens are over 2 times more likely to be arrested for violent crimes, 2.5 times more likely to be arrested for drug crimes, and over 4 times more likely to be arrested for property crimes.

These are quotes directly from a Trump-funded Department of Justice report.

I don't disagree with my colleague from North Carolina. Of course, if someone commits an assault against a law enforcement officer, they should be deported from this country. If somebody commits an assault against a community member, regardless of their occupation, they should be deported from this country. That is what the existing law says: If you are convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor assault—any crime of moral turpitude—you are deported.

And so, to me, this is duplicative at best and, at worst, an effort to just try to reinforce this very dangerous mythology that this country has something to fear from immigrants who are coming to this country to flee economic desperation and violence and terror and torture.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's comments, and I believe them to be sincere. But let's not get lost in the swirl of eloquence here.

I believe my colleague once said that illegal immigrants are "undocumented Americans"—a direct quote—and that they are "the people we care about most"—another direct quote—but I would submit that if you illegally enter the United States and then beat up a police officer, you are most certainly not an American. And the only thing we should care about is that you are deported.

Now, he said these laws can lead to deportation, but it is not necessary that they do particularly under this administration.

I refer to my prior remarks: There have been a half million illegal immigrants—a half million—with criminal records that have come into the homeland, again, illegally. And it is no surprise that they can commit crimes against Americans.

So this bill, which he seems to support—I am a little confused at the language. It seems like he might support this unanimous consent effort here because it is important because the current law does not cover all assaults against law enforcement. Deporting an illegal alien who assaults a law enforcement officer requires a complex legal analysis to prove that the illegal alien committed an aggravated felony or crime involving moral turpitude.

It is not guaranteed that this process will even lead to deportation. So the POLICE Act creates a simple, straightforward, commonsense rule that says illegal aliens who assault cops are deportable—period, end of story.

We saw it in North Carolina. We have recently seen it in New York City. And it can happen in a community near you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Vermont.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, we have had a dismal history recently with the U.S. Supreme Court. In my view, it has totally failed the American people.

In the name of States' rights, the Supreme Court has taken away freedom and caused distress and uncertainty for women and individuals across the country. It is outrageous that, because of this Court and this decision, people have fewer rights today than they did 50 years ago. Of course, I refer to the Dobbs decision, in which the Supreme Court—to its everlasting shame and in its infamy—took away a constitutional right.

It should be noted that, in a post-Dobbs world, women are leaning on contraceptive care more, and doctors see more demand. That now is threatened. For anyone who read that Dobbs decision and the Thomas concurrence in that decision, he laid it out where he at least intends to go.

There seems to be some confusion among my colleagues across the aisle about what this bill is and how important reproductive healthcare is, and I thank the Presiding Officer for his leadership on this with our colleague from Hawaii.

It is very important as everyone needs access both to whatever birth control options make the most sense to them and access to whatever preventive healthcare makes sense to them. Contraceptives can help prevent and treat medical conditions. This is about ensuring that every person in every ZIP Code has access to the birth control that they need if they need it.

This is the right of women and every individual to make decisions about their bodies and their futures. Politicians should not be involved. The Court shouldn't even be intimidating it is threatening to take that away, and this legislation is needed to guarantee that they won't.

After Roe was overturned in June 2022, Vermont voters went to the polls. They took their own liberty into their own hands after not being able to rely on the U.S. Supreme Court to protect it. In article 22 of the Vermont Constitution—a new amendment—it permanently protects reproductive liberties.

It says:

That an individual's right to personal reproductive autonomy is central to the liberty and dignity to determine one's own life course and shall not be denied or infringed unless justified by a compelling State interest achieved by the least restrictive means.

This would stop future anti-choice legislation from advancing in our State of Vermont.

We enacted comprehensive legislation in 2019 in Vermont, under a Republican Governor, that would "recognize

as a fundamental right the freedom of reproductive choice” and “prohibit public entities from interfering with or restricting the right of an individual to terminate the individual’s pregnancy.”

As far back as 1972, the Vermont Supreme Court became the fourth State in the Nation to legalize abortion. Vermont has a long history of protecting reproductive rights and standing up for the rights of women.

Also, contraception is supported by the American people. It is widely used by women. People who can get pregnant need it and use it. There are 9 out of 10 voters who “want it to be legal” and 3 out of 4 who want to have easier access. There are 78 percent who say “they see it as basic healthcare for women,” and 72 percent are “thankful it allows them to manage several health conditions.”

So it is absolutely essential, in the face of the U.S. Supreme Court and what it did to deprive women of their own right to choose by reversing the Roe v. Wade decision that was so enshrined in our law and part of our society for 50 years, that we in the Senate take all action possible to guarantee that women’s rights will be protected.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am so glad to come to the floor today to support my colleagues—the Presiding Officer, who is Senator MARKEY, and Senator HIRONO—as you champion a great and necessary bill, the Right to Contraception Act. I am proud to stand with my colleagues, and I am so proud to support this bill.

You know, today should have been a day of celebration. It was the 105th anniversary of the Senate’s passing the 19th Amendment—one of the greatest amendments ever passed—granting women the right to vote under the U.S. Constitution. That was truly a proud moment for this Chamber and one of the greatest victories ever in the march toward women’s equality—a march that New York proudly advanced. Upstate New York was a hotbed for the women’s suffrage movement, including in places like Seneca Falls.

But, on this 105th anniversary of the 19th Amendment’s passage, we must confront the ugly truth that women, sadly, have fewer freedoms today than they did just a few years ago, because, a few weeks from now, America will observe a different anniversary, a much darker anniversary, that of the MAGA Supreme Court’s overturning of Roe v. Wade. Thanks to that decision and thanks to the hard right’s war on women, reproductive freedoms are at their lowest point in modern history, and who knows how far the hard right will go. Two years ago, the MAGA Court eliminated the protections of Roe. Tomorrow, it could be something else. Maybe, it could be the Griswold decision that protected the right to use birth control.

To those who think that is outlandish or impossible to happen, just remember Clarence Thomas himself opened the door to this possibility in his concurring opinion on the day Roe was overturned. We are kidding ourselves if we think the hard right is satisfied with simply overturning Roe. And, for all those who say it can never happen, remember people said that before Dobbs—that Roe would never be overturned. Of course, unfortunately, it was by the rightwing MAGA Court, appointed by Donald Trump and our Republican colleagues here in the Senate.

So, tomorrow, the Senate will act. We will vote to move forward on the Right to Contraception Act. Supporting Federal protections for contraceptives should be the definition of what is a simple, commonsense, and easy choice. The bill we will vote on tomorrow simply says: If you want access to birth control or if your healthcare provider wants to prescribe birth control, the government has no right to interfere.

Doesn’t that seem like common sense? After all, access to birth control is something that 90 percent of Americans support.

Of course, we are already hearing the same predictable, tired, and unpersuasive retorts from the other side: that this vote is somehow unnecessary; that birth control could never possibly be at risk; that this is much ado about nothing. That is simply not true.

To those who argue Federal protections for birth control are unnecessary, go ask the people of Virginia what they think after their Republican Governor vetoed a bill that would have protected contraceptives at the State level. Go ask the people of Nevada what they think after their Republican Governor also vetoed a bill to protect access to birth control. To those who say birth control will never fall at risk, go ask the people of Florida or Arizona or Idaho or Iowa or Missouri. In each of these States, Republican Governors or Republican State legislators are on record blocking protections for birth control access in some form or another.

It is unacceptable—simply unacceptable—for Americans to even question whether or not access to birth control should fall at risk, but that is precisely the worry one in five Americans has today. We can eliminate that worry in one fell swoop by passing the Right to Contraception Act.

I hope both sides join together to show strong support for this essential bill tomorrow when we vote on it.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation vote on the Pipe nomination be at 12 noon tomorrow, Wednesday, June 5, and that the cloture vote with respect to the Sullivan nomination occur upon disposition of the Pipe nomination; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Sullivan nomination, all time be consid-

ered expired and the confirmation vote occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader; further, that following the cloture vote on the Sullivan nomination, the Senate then resume legislative session and resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 400, S. 4381, and that the cloture vote with respect to the motion to proceed occur at 3:45 p.m.; finally, that if any of the nominations are confirmed during Wednesday’s session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s actions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts.

#### RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today because reproductive freedom is under attack.

In 2022, Donald Trump’s far-right Supreme Court took away the constitutional right to an abortion, completing the Republican Party’s decades-long plan to overturn Roe.

In some States, the Court’s decision revived abortion bans that had lain dormant since the 1800s. In other States, the decision triggered new abortion restrictions rewritten to go into effect the very day that Roe v. Wade was overturned. The results have been horrific.

But here is the thing the Republican Party missed: From Kansas to Ohio, to California, reproductive rights are popular. Americans overwhelmingly support the right to an abortion, the right to IVF, and the right to contraception. In fact, these rights are so popular that Republicans want you to believe they support them, but their actions speak for themselves.

First, Republicans said they wouldn’t overturn Roe v. Wade. Donald Trump and his extremist Supreme Court did, and Trump is still bragging about it. Now, over 20 States have banned or severely restricted abortion access, passed laws criminalizing doctors who perform abortions, or threatened access to pregnancy care, miscarriage care, fertility assistance, and more.

Then Republicans claimed they wouldn’t go after IVF. Just this year, Alabama’s Supreme Court virtually outlawed IVF in the State, and just a few weeks later, my colleagues in the Republican Party blocked Federal legislation that would protect access to this care.

Now, the Republican Party is saying they won’t go after contraception. Well, that makes sense since 92 percent of Americans support birth control. But, guess what, Republicans now have contraception in their sights, and they are even trying to redefine what constitutes contraception. Sure, they support contraception—ah, but not an IUD; or they are all for contraception—hmm, but not Plan B.