

decision, only one in six Wisconsin abortion patients received out-of-State care. During our criminal abortion ban, that number skyrocketed to 9 out of 10 patients seeking care out of State.

Those families were being forced to drive, on average, 103 minutes to exercise their right to control their own bodies and get the care they needed, nearly double the time that they drove to access care before Roe fell.

And I am talking here about women who could afford the more than \$1,000 in costs to access that care. We must also be aware of those who could not. For example, patients traveling from out of State had to fork up an average of \$330 just for lodging.

In 2023 alone, Illinois and Minnesota providers saw over 6,000 patients from Wisconsin. You heard me right. Six thousand Wisconsin women were forced to travel sometimes hundreds of miles just to access healthcare. And even though Wisconsin has restored access to abortion in three counties, Planned Parenthood of Illinois is still seeing three times as many patients from Wisconsin compared to before the Dobbs decision came down. The reality is that abortion care is still only available in 3 of our 72 counties.

Exercising this fundamental freedom is out of reach for far too many in America. Twenty-two States across the country have abortion bans, and that means one in three women of reproductive age live in a State where they cannot get the healthcare they need because politicians are telling them that they know better.

Well, women and families deserve better. That is why last year I introduced the Reproductive Health Travel Fund Act to give millions of women without access to care in their home States a lifeline. This bill would ease the tremendous financial burden Republican abortion bans have placed squarely on women who are trying to access critical care. Women are spending hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars to pay for travel, lodging, meals, and childcare just to make their own healthcare decisions.

These past 2 years we have heard shocking stories of women, often desperate for help, having nowhere to turn. Last week, we even heard the story of a woman who died because she was denied abortion care until it was too late.

If my colleagues insist that this issue is a decision for the States and not for women, then I hope that they can at least recognize the tremendous hardship their patchwork of laws has created.

The rights you have as an American should not depend upon what State you live in. If we cannot restore Roe this Congress, we should, at the very least, extend a lifeline to the millions of women who are unable to access care in their own communities.

So as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor,

and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 2152, the Reproductive Health Travel Fund Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; 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 Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if my Democrat colleagues were honest, they would call this bill what it really is: the "Elective Abortion Travel Slush Fund for All Act." This bill authorizes 350 million taxpayer dollars for radical abortion groups to facilitate elective abortions.

And this money isn't limited to Americans. It would also give taxpayer money to noncitizens—illegal aliens—who are seeking abortions. This bill would use Federal funds to cover the cost of flights, food, hotels, and other expenses for any individual in the United States seeking abortion, paid for by the American taxpayers. It would even cover lost wages for those traveling to get abortion.

Fifty million dollars of taxpayer money in this bill would go directly to groups like Planned Parenthood to pay for advertising, website development, increasing staff, and building maintenance and construction, all of which will go to encouraging—if not coercing—women to get abortions, not to seek alternatives.

Now, there is a major inconvenient fact that Senate Democrats are ignoring: The Hyde amendment is clear, no taxpayer funds may be used for abortion. My colleagues will say: Well, no, this money isn't paying for abortions. But let's be clear. This taxpayer money is being used for one purpose: to take the lives of unborn children.

While the actual abortion procedures aren't covered by this bill, it covers every other cost associated with ensuring abortions happen.

Democrats know the Hyde amendment prevents and prohibits Federal dollars funding abortions. It has been the law of the land for 48 years. It was democratically agreed to then, and it still stands today. Still, today, 60 percent of voters agree with the Hyde amendment—on both sides of the aisle—that taxpayer dollars should not be used for abortions. I am sure that percentage is even higher for illegals getting taxpayer money for abortions.

But Democrats really don't care. Despite what they say, they will override American voters if democracy gets in the way of their latest leftwing pet project.

Democrats know States have democratically decided what their laws on abortions are. Now they are trying to override the will of the people and the will of the States by using the Federal Government and millions of taxpayer dollars to achieve their goal. This is

not only counter to the spirit of the Hyde amendment, it is contrary to the principles of federalism and the will of the American people.

As I pointed out for months last year with a similar illegal abortion policy Secretary Lloyd Austin implemented at the Department of Defense, no Agency—no Agency—is above the law. I called out the VA for implementing another illegal abortion policy.

This bill is just another page—another page—out of the Democrats' same extreme abortion playbook. This bill is a flimsy attempt to go around the law of the land.

Gone are the days of the Democrats saying abortions should be safe, legal, and rare. Democrats today want dangerous, illegal, and limitless abortions at any cost—any cost—to the American taxpayers.

So for that reason, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am disappointed with the objection and will agree with the Senator on one point, which is that this bill does not fund abortion.

The Senator referred to democratically passed laws relating to this subject, and I just wanted to remind him once more what I said in my opening statement: In Wisconsin, women lived for 15 months under a criminal abortion ban that was passed in 1849—70 years before women had the right to vote, before the Civil War. Obviously women had no input in that democratically enacted law.

But this bill simply breaks down a barrier that Americans are facing to access sometimes lifesaving care, a financial barrier, I might add, that Republicans put up when they inserted themselves into our exam rooms and into women's personal decisions.

I hope my Republican colleagues understand that women take notice when you vote down bills that protect and defend their basic freedoms. They see who is fighting for their right to control their bodies, health, families, and future.

I am proud to be standing here today on their behalf. This issue is not going away. We are going to keep fighting day in and day out because women want their rights and freedoms back.

Some of my colleagues are claiming that this is merely a messaging bill. Well, send Americans the message that you support their decisions to make their own healthcare choices and pass this bill into law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### ENHANCED PRESIDENTIAL SECURITY ACT OF 2024

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, last week, in both the House and the Senate, legislation was introduced to

increase the Secret Service protection for Presidential and Vice Presidential nominees. We all know why this legislation is needed. In the span of just 65 days, President Trump, our former President and the Republican nominee to be the next President of the United States, has been the target of two assassination attempts.

In Butler, PA, President Trump was shot in the head but miraculously was spared from death. Unfortunately, Fire Chief Corey Comperatore was killed by the assassin's bullets, and others were gravely injured by his gunfire. Then it happened again in my home State of Florida.

It is thanks to the incredible work of President Trump's Secret Service detail that another would-be assassin was unable to take a shot at the President while he was golfing with friends. We know that day could have ended much differently. We thank God that these attempts have not been successful. But each of these events has reminded the Nation of the dangers surrounding President Trump and the need to make sure he, his family, and those around him are safe. That is why I introduced the Protect Our Presidents Act here in the Senate and Representatives MIKE LAWLER and RITCHIE TORRES introduced the Enhanced Presidential Security Act in the House.

The safety and security of those seeking to lead our Nation should never be in jeopardy and should be applied regardless of party. That is why these bills ensure all Presidential nominees, both now and in the future, are provided the enhanced protection they clearly require and deserve.

On Friday, the House passed Representatives LAWLER and TORRES's bill in a unanimous vote of 405 to 0. This unanimous vote shows that when commonsense and desperately needed legislation come before Congress, we can act quickly to do what the American people expect of us.

I am proud to lead this effort in the Senate, and I am on the floor today to request the immediate passage of the Enhanced Presidential Security Act so we can send this good and necessary bill to President Biden's desk so it may become law.

Our action today goes beyond the simple language of this bill to increase the Secret Service protection for our party's Presidential and Vice Presidential nominees. Passing the Enhanced Presidential Security Act today, with the unanimous consent of the Senate, sends an important message to the American public and the world that we will not ignore these threats, which are truly an attack on our democratic process and have rightly shocked the world.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 9106, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMY). The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 9106) to direct the Director of the United States Secret Service to apply the same standards for determining the number of agents required to protect Presidents, Vice Presidents, and major Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me make it clear that I share Senator SCOTT's concern—deep concern—that the recent attacks on former President Trump's life have made it clear that there are security gaps in his protection. What happened in Butler and Palm Beach was unacceptable, and it cannot be allowed to happen again.

That is why this week, Congress is coming together, poised to pass a continuing resolution that I hope the Senator will support that will give the Secret Service \$231 million in additional funding to provide the Agency with the authority to spend money at a faster rate so that they can meet their mission, and their mission is "zero fail."

I am the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, which is charged with funding the Secret Service. I am proud of the quick work that we have done to identify the funds that can be spent between now and the election and between now and the inauguration to make sure that any gaps are closed.

The reason that I rise on this particular bill, though, is because I don't want to promise the American public more than this bill actually delivers.

This bill says that the Secret Service shall use "the same standards for determining the number of agents required to protect Presidents, Vice Presidents, and major Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates." Now, that may sound meaningful, but in reality, my sense is that that is current law.

Right now, when the Secret Service makes a determination on the provision of protection, it is assessing the protectee's life, their work, their travel patterns, the potential threats, and the risk of harm to that person. The standard that the Secret Service uses is to provide whatever protection level is necessary to meet that "zero fail" mission to protect the person under their charge. With a team of experts, the Secret Service determines the level and the type of protection that is needed. That is the process, and those are the existing standards.

Let's be clear. Commanders in Chief—Presidents of the United States—do have certain unique requirements regarding their protection. For instance, the Department of Defense is supplying a traveling Commander in Chief with certain capabilities, chiefly amongst them the ability to stay in contact with our nuclear triad and

communication assets necessary for the President to be in seamless communication with the Department of Defense and military command should a crisis arise. That is a unique set of capabilities that a Commander in Chief has, and it goes into the assessment that the Secret Service makes as to the level of protection that the Commander in Chief needs.

They are using the same standard—do whatever is necessary in order to protect the life of the protectee—but Commanders in Chief, because they are Commanders in Chief, have a different constellation of assets that surround them that mean that the standard gets applied accordingly.

So I am not actually going to object. I am not sure that this bill changes anything about the way the Secret Service approaches their mission. They are going to continue to do whatever is necessary in order to protect the detailee, to protect the individual under their mandate. I think the much more substantive thing we are going to do this week is to get them the resources they need. My hope is that all of my Republican colleagues who have been talking about the importance of Secret Service protection are willing to support this increase in funding that the continuing resolution will include.

I will end by expressing my additional hope that we will seek to have a more holistic conversation here about how to protect former President Trump, how to protect President Biden, and how to protect Vice President HARRIS.

I am ready to move forward with this bill. I don't think it does anything to meaningfully change the way that the Secret Service approaches their job. I am ready to move forward on additional assets.

But we also continue to choose to give weapons of mass destruction to assassins. Other nations around the world don't choose to hand weapons with such accurate long-range capabilities, such powerful destructive force, to these assassins whose brains are breaking.

We also have a constellation of actors in this country who are engaged in a web of conspiracy theories. There is a justification of political violence that exists in this country today—apologies for those people who tried to kill us, attacked us on January 6—that leads many others to contemplate that they will also be let off the hook for their acts of political violence.

So I take the protection of former President Trump and Vice President HARRIS and everyone under Secret Service protection very seriously.

Let's move ahead with this bill. I don't think it actually solves the problem. Let's pass the additional money so that they have everything they need—the Secret Service—in order to get the job done. Then let's sit down and have a broader conversation about why we have seen this spike in political violence and what other ways Republicans and Democrats can come together.

Only by having that comprehensive conversation about funding, about the lethal means of assassination, about the celebration of political violence that happens in this country will we really do the job that is necessary and help the Secret Service reach their "zero fail" mission.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, H.R. 9106, the Enhanced Presidential Security Act, passed the House of Representatives last week and is currently pending in the Senate. As chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over the U.S. Secret Service, I would like to offer a few thoughts on this legislation, which I support.

The bill requires the Director of the Secret Service to follow the same standards for determining agent staffing levels for the President, Vice President, and major Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. The bill also directs the Secret Service to conduct an internal review of its protection authorities and submit to Congress a report that includes recommendations for improvements.

Since the first assassination attempt on former President Donald Trump, the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate Homeland and Government Affairs Committee have received a classified briefing and held a joint hearing where we heard testimony from the Secret Service and the FBI. We have worked on a bipartisan basis to get to the bottom of how the Secret Service failed to protect former President Trump on July 13.

Following the awful events of July 13 in Butler, PA, the Secret Service elevated the posture of its protectees and bolstered protective details to ensure the highest levels of safety and security.

Specifically, former President Trump is receiving additional personnel and protective assets at levels comparable to that of the President of the United States.

Additionally, the Secret Service has dedicated available protective assets typically reserved for the President to the Vice President and both Vice Presidential candidates.

H.R. 9106 serves to capture in statute these efforts undertaken by the Secret Service and Department of Homeland Security to dedicate critical resources and personnel to mitigate the inherent risk in the protection of the President, Vice President, and other major Presidential candidates who seek our Nation's highest office in this heightened threat environment.

I am concerned that the bill does not address the recruitment and retention challenges that have been perennial problems for the Agency. With the Secret Service now providing the same protections to candidates that it does for the sitting President, the strains on available agents will become even more apparent. Congress must continue working to address these issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I further ask 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 with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 9106) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues for their support of this commonsense legislation, which has now passed with unanimous, bipartisan support in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I will continue working with my colleagues to ensure nominees for President and Vice President are never in jeopardy and are provided the enhanced protection they clearly require and deserve.

This bill will now go to President Biden's desk, and I hope he acts quickly to sign it into law.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, welcome to the Senate. You look good up there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you, sir.

#### CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, the Federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is seemingly doing everything they can to prevent our veterans and seniors from receiving quality long-term care. That is their mission, but they seem to be doing everything they can to prevent it.

Instead of working to ensure quality care for our veterans and seniors, the Agency seems hyperfocused on what appears to be a warpath—a warpath to push long-term care facilities to their limit. Rather than listening to the substantial feedback from facilities and managers, healthcare leaders, and Members of Congress, the Agency insists on implementing these overbearing, unrealistic rules and procedures to flex its bureaucratic muscle, as if to just show us how big their muscles are.

The actions of CMS are far beyond misguided, and the result is the intentional—it seems to me—disregard for the actual safety and care of the seniors and veterans they are charged to care for.

In North Dakota, our facilities are really feeling the squeeze, and the issue is really twofold. First and most importantly for my State, the minimum staffing rule—the minimum staffing rule. In an attempt to ensure adequate staffing levels, CMS went over the top.

In May, CMS issued this minimum staffing rule which requires long-term care facilities to implement new staffing requirements. Now, these are institutions that are already woefully understaffed because of a lack of a workforce.

Most burdensome is the new requirement to have a registered nurse—a registered nurse—on-site 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, rather than the previous 8 hours a day, 7 days a week. Less than a quarter of North Dakota's facilities meet this requirement, and among rural facilities only 14 percent will meet that mandate.

And we should make no mistake, this is an unfunded, one-size-fits-all mandate coming from the bureaucratic bullies at CMS. In fact, by CMS's own lowball estimates, this regulation—it is almost hard for me to say this number. By their low-ball estimates, this regulation will cost facilities over \$40 billion to comply. Why would you want to impose \$40 billion more of unproductive costs on our facilities that are there to care for our seniors and our veterans?

To meet these elevated staffing levels, our facilities really have no good options, if they have any options at all. At existing staff levels, North Dakota facilities would need to reduce the average number of residents served per day by about 74 people to satisfy this mandate. Let me say that again: To meet this mandate, North Dakota facilities would have to reduce—reduce—the people they care for by 74.

They are being required to hire more staff from a supply of registered nurses that simply does not exist. I don't know why they would be surprised by this. We have a nursing shortage. Hello, CMS. Wake up. Listen to one or two people, and you will know we have a nursing shortage in this country, and it is particularly challenging in rural America.

Now, if they don't get that, if they don't find the nurses, of course, they do have the option of reducing the number of seniors they serve, as I mentioned earlier, or just closing their doors entirely. That doesn't seem to meet the stated goal of CMS.

It is also clear that this rule will disproportionately harm our small, rural States like North Dakota, as I said, and certainly our rural facilities. These are the same facilities already struggling to stay open. In my State, we have had six facilities close since 2021, indicating the already challenging operating environment, and I fear this misguided rule will supercharge this trend and deprive rural individuals—remember, these are people, CMS; rural individuals, people—the opportunity to receive care in their home communities, near the people they love and know the best: their families and their friends, their loved ones.

Mr. President, this math just doesn't add up. How does CMS not understand that this mandate is impossible to meet? Or maybe they do. I fear that