

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 776.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Matthew A. Schwartz, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 776, Matthew A. Schwartz, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Ashley Moody, James Lankford, Todd Young, Ted Budd, Pete Ricketts, Jon Husted, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Bernie Moreno, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, James C. Justice, Eric Schmitt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Montana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 205

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator LANKFORD for organizing this time today because tomorrow, June 24, marks a pivotal anniversary in our Nation's history. In fact, it was 4 years ago that the Supreme Court ruled that there is no Federal constitutional right to abortion and overturned *Roe v. Wade* in a landmark

6-3 decision that altered the landscape of the pro-life movement forever.

Reflect for a moment on how things would be different today if the Court had decided otherwise. If the Court decided there was a national right to abortion, society's culture of death would be more prevalent; States would be prevented from enacting pro-life laws, and as a result, millions of unborn children would have been killed and countless more women would have experienced the trauma of losing their child.

I remember back in 2018 when I founded the U.S. Senate Pro-Life Caucus. I had no idea how important our work would become. I had no idea that we would get the opportunity to confirm pro-life Justices to the Supreme Court, including Justice Amy Coney Barrett, who became part of the majority on the Supreme Court to overturn *Roe*.

The pro-life movement was given a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to help promote a culture of life. And thanks to an incredible nationwide movement of grassroots activists, countless hearts and countless minds have been changed.

We cannot understate the importance of that day 4 years ago.

I remember I was struck by a profound truth that is found in the Book of Jeremiah 1:5. It says:

Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you, and before you were born, I set you apart.

That is why there is dignity and value in every single life, including the unborn, the disabled, and the aging. Unfortunately, these beliefs are under attack by pro-abortion advocates who use a disability diagnosis to justify abortion.

Between 60 to 80 percent of babies diagnosed with Down syndrome are aborted in America. In fact, it is even higher in other countries. Nearly 100 percent in Denmark and Iceland.

Let that sink in for a moment.

Why would we ever think that is OK? To use a prenatal diagnosis as a case for abortion is discrimination at best and eugenics at worst. It also spurs the belief that having Down syndrome makes your life less valuable or not worth living.

Individuals with Down syndrome make meaningful contributions to society and are loved by their families and friends. It is ironic that we celebrate Special Olympics here in the Washington. And yet we promote a prenatal diagnosis as a case to abort those athletes when they are in the womb.

That is why I introduced the Protecting Individuals with Down Syndrome Act, which will ban doctors from performing abortions because the child received a prenatal Down syndrome diagnosis.

Our Constitution says that all individuals are endowed by our Creator—that is with capital C—with the unalienable right to life.

There is no clause that I can find that says “except for individuals with

Down syndrome.” There is no clause that says “except for anyone with a disability.” It is very clear: Every person has a right to life. It is our duty to protect that life and be a voice for the voiceless.

So I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill and for all the other pro-life legislation that my colleagues are speaking on today and tomorrow. I am confident that one day, by the grace and the hand of God, abortion will be unthinkable, and every preborn child will be protected by the law.

So this week as we celebrate this anniversary of the historic *Dobbs* decision, let's reflect with grateful hearts on the progress we have made, and let's look forward with hope to a future where every life, born and unborn, is valued.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 205 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the provision that is being offered by the Senator from Montana, we should be very clear as to what it does: It makes it illegal for a medical professional to perform an abortion with the knowledge that a pregnant woman is seeking an abortion, in whole or in part—in whole or in part—on the basis of a test result indicating the fetus has Down syndrome, a prenatal diagnosis that the fetus has Down syndrome, or any other reason to believe the fetus may have Down syndrome.

Understand what the Senator from Montana is saying. We are holding the medical professional—the doctor, in most cases—responsible for understanding the reason why a person is seeking an abortion, in whole or in part, which suggests to me that it may not even be a major part but just a consideration, if at all.

So what is the penalty that the Senator from Montana would assess on the doctor who proceeds with the procedure which may be legal in the State it is being performed?

If there is any question, even in whole or in part, that it involves Down syndrome, 5 years in prison—5 years in prison for that doctor.

It goes on to say that it would be illegal for a medical professional to help a woman cross State lines for the purpose of obtaining an abortion due to a Down syndrome concern. That also has a penalty of 5 years in prison.

It is serious.

So I guess the question I have to ask is, Is it our role as a politician, elected official, to call into question the reasons why someone may pursue a particular medical procedure?

The Senator from Montana says, yes, and if that involves even partially a consideration of Down syndrome, 5 years in prison.

I understand the compelling argument being made here, but there are compelling arguments to be made on both sides when it comes to this issue. If Republicans actually really wanted to help the Down syndrome community, they ought to focus on the issues that the community cares about.

How would I know those issues? I went to the National Down Syndrome Society and saw the list of their top legislative priorities.

No. 1, the top legislative priority for Down syndrome: Protecting Medicaid, No. 1, because it provides free health coverage for people with Down syndrome. And yet, we know what happened. This measure, the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, was considered on the floor of the U.S. Senate, the future of Medicaid.

Every Republican Senator, including the Senator offering this provision, voted to cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion over the next several years.

I have checked in my State, downstate hospitals and clinics and doctors alike, and they said this is going to have a devastating impact on low-income individuals and individuals with disabilities. The National Down Syndrome Society knows that. That is why their highest priority—they would ask this Senate, this Congress, to function in this capacity, to protect Medicaid. But that is not the subject of the Senator's amendment before us today.

Their second priority at the National Down Syndrome Society is ending discrimination with organ transplantation.

And the third priority is important as well: Increasing funding for medical research at the National Institutes of Health.

That is the same appropriation which, for 2 successive years, Republican President Donald Trump has attempted to cut dramatically. Some restoration has taken place in Congress.

So the three highest priorities of the National Down Syndrome Society do not include the amendment coming before us today.

Whether or when or how to start a family is an important decision best left entirely to a woman, her family, her healthcare provider. The U.S. Senate should not be involved in that decision making. There is no Member of the Senate who I think is competent to judge someone else's circumstances and what is going through their mind when they make a critical medical decision like this one.

Today, we had a hearing, a spotlight hearing, on this issue, noting, as the Senator from Montana did, that we soon—tomorrow—will reach the fourth anniversary of the Dobbs decision.

There were two women there who testified about their pregnancies and the problems that they ran into. Coincidentally, they were both mothers of

children who were having subsequent babies, anxious to welcome those babies into the world, and then a sonogram disclosed terrible circumstances affecting that fetus.

One lady's situation in Texas was she had to carry a fetus to term that could not survive. It was anencephalic. She was required under Texas law because they don't want to even get close to the notion of ending a pregnancy prematurely—she waited, risking her own health until a deadline was reached set by the legislature in Texas.

Another lady, similar circumstance, a mother with a subsequent child, she thought everything was just fine, and the sonogram disclosed that the baby could not survive. That is a fact. That is a reality.

To generalize and suggest that people are making selfish or personal decisions is really unfair. Each circumstance really begs the question as to whether we, as legislators, have a better insight into what is proper for a person in those circumstances or not.

I think that this provision is not necessary. I believe that the Down Syndrome Society has listed their priorities, and this measure from the Senator of Montana is not one of them.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Iowa.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 177

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, today, I join millions of Americans commemorating the Dobbs Supreme Court decision anniversary. We are united in two simple truths: Abortion is not a constitutional right, but life is. And life is a gift worth protecting. Each and every one of us was given this gift.

When we honor the dignity of every human being, we give them a chance to become loving sons and daughters, neighbors, and leaders.

This is not a political issue for me; it is deeply personal. Few things have brought me greater joy than when I first became a mother and, more recently, a grandmother. Holding my daughter and my grandson and watching them grow are memories I will always cherish. I want to protect and preserve this same experience for young mothers everywhere.

Last month, Stephanie, a constituent in Iowa, entrusted me with her story about the lasting effects of her abortion experience. With her permission, I am sharing her account, including the loss of her unborn child.

My daughter Lily died during an abortion procedure at 21 weeks. At the time, I was a young girl in crisis, frightened and unequipped to understand the full consequences of what I would experience afterwards. The effects did not end with the procedure itself. They affected me psychologically, emotionally, physically, and spiritually.

At 17, I had very little language or support to help me understand those effects. I believe many women face similar trauma without diagnoses, treatment, or meaningful follow-up care. In the years since, I have experienced PTSD symptoms, grief, and significant emotional and hormonal changes after losing my child.

My concern extends beyond my own experience. There appears to be too little long-term follow-up care, too little research into women's post-abortion outcomes, and too little screening for trauma before and after abortion procedures, especially later term abortions.

Women should be better informed about possible mental, physical, and emotional effects and should have access to appropriate care when those effects arise.

On this solemn note, there is no doubt we can do better by women and mothers-to-be, and that is what my Protect Funding for Women's Healthcare Act is all about. My Protect Funding for Women's Healthcare Act prohibits taxpayer dollars from going to Planned Parenthood. Instead, the bill redirects those funds to women's healthcare providers and ensures no reduction in Federal funding for women's health services.

As I continue to protect the life-changing experience of becoming a mother, I want mothers and families to know that they are supported in pregnancy and beyond no matter their situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 177. Further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise today to object to the Senator from Iowa's legislation, which would defund Planned Parenthood—defund Planned Parenthood and prevent millions of men and women across the country from being able to access the healthcare which they need.

This bill, which targets the largest provider of reproductive care in this country, is part of my Republican colleagues' relentless efforts to undermine reproductive rights and further erode the health, the freedom, and the dignity of the American people.

Four years ago this week, the Supreme Court issued its Dobbs decision, tearing down nearly 50 years of constitutional protections and declaring