women who are trying to defend his country. You may have seen him breaking bread with some guys this morning. He has put his life on the line for his country, and he is not backing down, and his bravery has changed the world this week.

We don't know how things are going to unfold over the course of the next weeks and months, but Zelenskyy has changed the trajectory this week of Germany, of Finland, of Sweden, of Switzerland, and of kids all over the 7.8 billion-person planet. Zelenskyy is a symbol, and as a courageous man, he has already changed the world. He is a bigger man than Putin. The whole world knows that. Putin's own army knows that. Even Putin's cronies now know that.

But it is not just the Ukrainians who are going to be burying their dead. Russians are going to be burying many of their sons, as well. Thousands of Russians—many of whom are conscripts—will have died needlessly for Vladimir Putin's lies and his vanity.

Putin told Russian parents that their sons were off on training exercise and that they would be welcomed as heroes at the end of these exercises. He didn't tell them they would be shot, lit on fire, blown to bits. He didn't say these things because he is a liar.

While we applaud the bravery of Ukrainians, we should not overlook the humanity of these Russians who will also die, for the West's battle—freedom's battle—is not with Russian moms who didn't even know their boys were being deployed, women who would not desire to have the dictator Putin send their sons to ruin. Human beings are made in the image of God and are dying, and Vladimir Putin alone bears responsibility.

His evil ambitions are destroying not just Ukrainian bodies and souls but also Russian bodies and souls, and this conflict, this chosen war of aggression by Vladimir Putin, is disgusting, and if he actually cared for anything bigger than his ego, if he actually cared for his people, if he actually cared for his nation, the generations of Russians whom this war is going to impoverish, then he would find an off-ramp now. That is what a bigger man would do.

Ukraine, on the other hand, is not the aggressor here. We are seeing a people fighting for their survival because Putin has given them no other choice, and his thugs will keep on killing innocents until they are expelled from Ukraine's borders.

We obviously don't know how history will unfold here, but we do know that truth is on the Ukrainians' side, and the truth is this: that the boys of Snake Island and President Zelenskyy and the broader Ukrainian national resistance are mounting a defense of freedom unlike anything the West has seen since the end of the Cold War.

And that is why this story of Snake Island matters. It is why Zelenskyy's bravery is so important, not just for Ukraine but for the whole world. And it is why that little woman's sunflower seeds are so inspired—for ordinary Ukrainians are responding to Putin's aggression with extraordinary heroism.

We should be in awe of what our friends are accomplishing. Make no mistake though, war is not an abstraction. Our 21st century jargon about kinetic action and lethal force tries to paper over a reality as old as Cain and Abel. War is young men and young women struggling for a last gasp of air while their blood soaks into the mud.

War is started by the old but usually waged by the young, and no one in their right mind would ever wish for war, for it is ugly. But the cause can be necessary, and, in this case, the Ukrainian cause is just. Their war for their country, for their freedom, and for their kids' futures is just. The Ukrainians are willing to shed their blood for their cause, but, as importantly, they are willing to soak the streets with the blood of Russians, who have been sent by the comfortable tyrant Putin, who sends his people to die pointlessly far from home while he consumes the billions that he has stolen from those same people.

Let's be steely-eyed about the coming days and weeks, because things tonight, at 4:30 in the morning, in Ukraine, are ugly, and they are going to get much, much worse. But Ukraine's heroes, despite of the dark nights that are ahead—their heroes—deserve our reverence. While it is ugly in Ukraine, their stories need to be told around the world by free people who believe in human dignity, for there is a great pantheon of freedom fighters across time, men and women who have died fighting tyrants, and we should tell their story. We must celebrate their cause, and we should arm them with as many Javelins and Stingers and rifles as they can possibly use.

We should ship them rations and ammo, and we should share actionable intelligence in realtime with them so they can try to repel the invading force, for as long as they are fighting tyrants, America stands with them and America will arm them, and I am convinced that this Senate will rise to the call to arm these Ukrainian freedom fighters in memory of those boys from Snake Island and all those who are joining their throng.

Glory to Ukraine. Glory to her heroes. America stands with you.

MORNING BUSINESS

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, 49 years ago, the Supreme Court issued its landmark decision in Roe v. Wade. By an overwhelming, 7–2 vote, the Justices declared that a woman's choice to have an abortion is a constitutionally protected right.

For nearly five decades, the Supreme Court's holding in Roe v. Wade has ensured that millions of Americans can access their essential, reproductive healthcare rights. But today, Roe v. Wade is hanging by a thin thread. A majority of the current conservative Court appears poised to overturn Roe at the first opportunity. It is up to Congress to safeguard the protections guaranteed under Roe v. Wade by passing the Women's Health Protection Act, also known as WHPA.

For decades, abortion opponents have waged a relentless assault on women's right to choose. And for decades, the Supreme Court—even with conservative majorities—has protected the core principles of Roe. But the tides are turning rapidly.

In December, the Justices heard oral arguments in the case of a Mississippi law banning nearly all abortions after 15 weeks of pregnancy. Because the Mississippi law is clearly unconstitutional under Roe and its progeny, it was blocked by lower courts. But this Supreme Court, with its far-right majority, granted review anyway. And in their questioning, several conservative Justices seemed ready to overturn Roe.

This threat to women's health and freedom is unprecedented. In the words of U.S. Solicitor General Elizabeth Prelogar, who argued before the Supreme Court on behalf of the Federal Government: ''The Court has never revoked a right that is so fundamental to so many Americans and so central to their ability to participate fully and equally in society.''

Even without the threat from the Supreme Court, the right of women to control their reproductive health and lives is under attack. Last year, lawmakers in 47 States introduced more than 560 laws imposing new restrictions on reproductive rights.

In the face of this unprecedented assault on reproductive rights, Congress must step up and pass WHPA. WHPA would protect the right to access reproductive healthcare, free from medically unnecessary restrictions, no matter where you live.

I commend Senator BLUMENTHAL—the lead sponsor—and all of my colleagues who support this important and necessary measure, and I hope we will have bipartisan support in passing it.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

• Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Women's Health Protection Act and pleased to submit my remarks regarding this critical legislation. I regret that I am unable to attend the full Senate vote on this bill today due to a death in the family.

The Women's Health Protection Act would guarantee the right to an abortion. The bill would allow a patient to access an abortion and ensure providers are able to deliver those services

without the burden of medically unnecessary restrictions.

Now more than ever, we need to protect this fundamental right. Nearly 50 years after the Supreme Court guaranteed the right to safe and legal abortion in Roe v. Wade, reproductive rights are under direct attack.

States are introducing laws at an alarming rate that seek to dramatically limit or outright ban abortion access. Some of these restrictive laws ban abortion after the 6th week of pregnancy, before many people know they are pregnant.

Even more concerning, we may no longer be able to rely on the Supreme Court to protect reproductive rights. The Supreme Court recently finished hearing oral arguments in a case about Mississippi's restrictive abortion law. Many Americans, including myself, are worried that the Supreme Court could significantly diminish or altogether overturn Roe v. Wade.

The repercussions of such a decision would be devastating. According to the Guttmacher Institute, more than half of U.S. States are poised to ban or severely restrict abortion access if this landmark decision is overturned. I remember what it was like prior to Roe v. Wade. I understand the heartbreaking and often unsafe situations that pregnant individuals face.

We must respond by passing the Women's Health Protection Act. Congress must do everything it can to ensure that individuals are able to access critical medical care and make the best decisions possible for their health. I am proud to cosponsor this important bill, and I won't stop fighting to protect fundamental reproductive rights.●

THE WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. KING. Madam President, I voted to proceed to the consideration of the Women's Health Protection Act today with some reluctance, not because of any doubts about the substance of the bill—I have been a strong supporter of reproductive choice throughout my public life—but because of concern about and disagreement with some of the provisions of its introductory ''Findings'' section.

Several of these provisions assert that opposition to reproductive services, including abortion, is rooted in racism and misogyny. I don't believe that this is true, and I do believe that it is unfair and insulting to the millions of Americans whose opposition to abortion is rooted in their faith and deeply held moral principles. While I disagree with their conclusion—that it is appropriate for the government to impose these beliefs on others who do not share them and thereby intrude into the personal medical choices of all women—I don't question their motives and strongly disagree with the language of the bill that does so.

My vote today was not a vote on the final passage of the bill, but only to bring it to the Senate floor for debate and amendment. Had the motion succeeded, I, along with many of my colleagues, would have voted to remove this inflammatory and unnecessary language from the bill.

Fundamentally, this issue is about who should have the power to make this most personal and difficult choice, the government or individual women in consultation with their doctors. While respecting the motives of those who disagree, I think that power should rest with the woman.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Ms. SINEMA. Madam President, I strongly believe a woman's healthcare decisions should be between her, her doctor, and her family, which is why I voted to advance today's bill. If it advanced, I would have offered an amendment to remove editorial language that has no legislative effect and needlessly disparages everyday Americans based on their deeply and sincerely held beliefs. On issues so important and personal to many Americans, both parties should seek respectful understanding instead of ascribing motives or insulting those who hold different beliefs.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President; today, I voted that the Senate should proceed to consider H.R. 3755, the Womens Health Protection Act, which would codify in Federal law the privacy of women's reproductive healthcare established by the Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade decision.

I support the privacy of women's healthcare, codification of Roe v. Wade, and proceeding to consideration of this measure. Should the Senate proceed, however, nonbinding commentary in the bill's preamble as currently drafted wrongly and unfairly impugns the motives and integrity of fellow Americans who view this issue differently.

I represent a State with a broad diversity of views, and I respect that diversity. I respect the opinions of my constituents even when I do not share them, and I recognize that good people may arrive at different opinions in good faith.

So should the Senate proceed to consider this measure, as I will vote that it should, it must remove from the preamble to this bill divisive rhetoric that wrongly accuses Georgians who hold a different view than mine of having views rooted in misogyny. In a country so politically polarized and divided, we must recommit to tolerance and mutual respect.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 22–15, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Australia for defense articles and services estimated to cost $122 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

JAMES A, HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22–15

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Australia.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment * $34 million.
Other $88 million.
Total $122 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Australia has requested the possible sale of AN/AAQ 24(V)N Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) component systems required to support an ongoing upgrade of its large Air Mobility Platforms, which include C–17As, KC–30As, and C–130Js.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Twenty-seven (27) AN/AAQ 24(V)N Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) System Processor Replacements (LSPR) (27 installed, 0 spares).

Thirty (30) Guardian Laser Turret Assemblies (GLTA) (30 installed, 0 spares).

Non-MDE: Also included are LAIRCM Control Indicator Unit Replacements (CIURs); Advanced Threat Missile Warning Sensors (ATWs); Smart Card Assemblies (SCAs); High Capacity Cards/User Data Memory Cards (HCCs/UDMs) (installed and spares); Simple Key Loaders; initial spares, consumables, and repair/return support; support and test equipment; integration and test support; personnel training, publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.