

Insert after the second whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas Super Bowl LIV was the culmination of the 100th season of the NFL, a season in which the league has promoted stars both past and present, served the community, and looked toward the next 100 years of football;

**SA 1326.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 490, congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League."

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I have 3 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### COMMEMORATING UTAH WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I rise to mark the 150th anniversary of the first ballot cast by a woman in the United States under an equal suffrage law. I am proud that this remarkable milestone occurred in my home State of Utah.

The fight for the right to vote for all Americans, regardless of gender, race, or class, was achieved through efforts, large and small, and through great sacrifice.

Suffrage is the freedom to vote, to reaffirm the solemn duty of the citizen in a representative democracy. When I vote, I remember the sacrifice of men and women in uniform—of those who have won and preserved freedom for us in the past and of those who preserve it for us today. My vote is a recognition of that sacrifice. It is right and fitting that every American, male and female, has that same privilege.

Our great State of Utah was settled by pioneers like Brigham Young, who led his people to a new land in search of liberty and freedom from oppression. While the pioneers and settlers of Utah secured freedom of territory, religion, and thought, the voices of women were still not heard when it often mattered most—during the democratic selection of their government leaders.

Seraph Young, like her granduncle Brigham Young before her, endeavored to chart a different course. In the early morning of February 14, 1870, she became the first woman to vote in the United States of America. On that election day in Salt Lake City, 24 other women joined Seraph Young in casting their ballots. Then, in the next election, 2,000 more women followed their lead and exercised their equal suffrage rights. The voices of the few set in motion a monumental shift in our Nation's history.

Twenty-four years before the 19th Amendment to grant equal suffrage for women was ratified, Utah once again made history by electing the Nation's first female State senator, Martha Hughes Cannon. Cannon did not hesitate to pursue her own path. After receiving her undergraduate degree in chemistry, she went on to earn degrees in oration, medicine, and pharmacy at a time when few women pursued advanced education. As a physician, church leader, suffragist, and mother, she defeated her own husband at the ballot box to become the first female State senator in U.S. history.

Soon, we will honor the tremendous contributions Martha Hughes Cannon and all women suffragists have made as we welcome her as a new addition to Statuary Hall in the U.S. Capitol.

The symbols we choose to represent us and our State matter a great deal, and the bronze rendering of Cannon will serve as an enduring tribute to the efforts of all suffragists.

To all the women who have led and who continue to lead by example, we thank you.

#### RECOGNIZING THE LEADING ROLE OF UTAHNS IN THE FIGHT FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AND CELEBRATING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE FIRST VOTES BY WOMEN UNDER THE EQUAL SUFFRAGE LAW OF UTAH ON FEBRUARY 14, 1870

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 475 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 475) recognizing the leading role of Utahns in the fight for women's suffrage and celebrating the sesquicentennial of the first votes by women under the equal suffrage law of Utah on February 14, 1870.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 475) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of January 16, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### PROTECTING PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILDREN

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, earlier this week the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing to discuss the level of care babies who are born alive should receive. You heard me correctly. We had a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee to discuss the level of medical care a baby that is born alive should receive.

As heartbreaking as it is to even ask that question—as if there were more than one option—this is a real debate and something that needs to be paid attention to.

There are actually some folks who think it is appropriate for doctors to provide something less than the highest standard of care to babies who survive abortions, and there are those who believe babies who survive abortions should receive the same level of medical assistance as any other baby. That is certainly where I stand. I believe that all life is precious and that every baby deserves a fighting chance.

I can't imagine that there is a divergence of view on this topic. Of course, public opinion polling, for what that is worth, shows that the vast majority of Americans agree. Last year, a poll found that more than three-quarters of Americans support providing medical support for babies who survive abortions. It is hard for me to believe that there would be 25 percent on the other side of that, but, suffice it to say, the vast majority of people agree with the proposition that the same medical standard of care should apply.

Unfortunately, there are people who make up that 25 percent in government who are in high-ranking positions and who wield a great deal of influence on this question. Take, for example, Virginia's Governor Ralph Northam. About this time last year, he made

comments which were deeply disturbing about how to care—or rather, not care—for certain newborn babies.

He was caught during an interview. I would like to think he misspoke, but he certainly didn't claim that. This was actually his view. He said that after the baby was delivered, it would be kept comfortable. The baby "would be resuscitated if that's what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother."

What would be the subject of that discussion, whether the baby would live or die? Presumably so. Instead of providing prompt care to save the baby, Governor Northam—who is, by the way, a pediatrician, of all things—believes that you should sit down and decide whether to let the child live or die. That is not healthcare. That is infanticide.

In response to Governor Northam's comments—which, apparently, he spoke not just for himself but for a significant segment, maybe the 25 percent in that poll I mentioned earlier—our colleague from Nebraska, Senator SASSE, introduced a bill called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This legislation is very straightforward. It would require doctors who treat babies who survive an abortion with the same lifesaving care that other infants receive. It sounds like common sense, right? Well, common sense apparently is not all that common in some quarters.

You might think that surely there are already protections that exist for that newborn baby. That has to be the law already, right? Sadly not. There are no Federal laws requiring healthcare providers to care for these babies just as they would any other infant in their care.

Sadly, many of our Democratic colleagues in the Senate are just fine with that. When the Senate voted on this legislation last year, 44 Democrats voted against it—against it. But for those of us who are aligned more with the 75 percent of Americans who believe all babies deserve that care, we are not fine with that.

This legislation would build on the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, which actually passed the Senate unanimously at the time. That bill clarified that any infant born alive at any stage of development is a person—again, a statement of the obvious—regardless of the manner in which they were born.

Now it is time to clarify that each person will receive appropriate medical care, no matter what their circumstances and how they happened to be delivered and born.

One of our witnesses in today's and Tuesday's hearings was Dr. Robin Pierucci, a neonatologist at Bronson Methodist Hospital. Dr. Pierucci discussed the medical standard of care for babies born alive and concluded that "we are always obligated to care, whether or not we have the ability to heal."

I agree with her. There should only be one side to this question—the side that advocates for equal medical care for newborns, the side that believes that all infants deserve a fighting chance, the side that believes that life is precious and must be protected.

When I attended this hearing, it reminded me of an article that was written back in 2004 by one of my favorite writers, Peggy Noonan. She was talking about a Presidential candidate, General Wesley Clark, running that year for the Democratic nomination for President. She quotes an interview that General Clark had with the publisher of the Manchester Union-Leader, Joseph McQuaid. Here is how the conversation went.

General Clark says: I don't think you should get the law involved in abortion.

McQuaid said: At all?

Clark said: Nope.

McQuaid said: Late-term abortion? No limits?

Clark said: Nope.

McQuaid said: Anything up to delivery?

Clark said: Nope, nope.

McQuaid: Anything up to the head coming out of the womb?

Clark said: I say it is up to the woman and her doctor, her conscience. You don't put the law in there.

Back when the Supreme Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, it made clear that at some point, once the fetus is viable, you are dealing with more than just the interest of the mother. I know the whole debate over abortion is divisive in this country, but at some point you have to realize you are not just talking about one person but two people, and each of those individuals has rights, and the State certainly has an interest in protecting a vulnerable child.

In my State of Texas—and I dare say in Florida and in every other State in the country—we have child protection laws in place which say if you witness child abuse or neglect, you have a legal duty to report it. Again, the law says, if you see a child that is being abused or neglected, you have a duty to report it, and if you don't do it, you are guilty of a crime.

How in the world we could reconcile these ideas that it is somehow OK to deliver a child, even though it is a botched abortion, and not have a legal, much less a moral, duty to care for that child is irreconcilable.

I think it is really important for the Senate to stand on the side of life. This is not an abortion issue. This is a matter of equal protection under the law and whether we are going to fulfill our duty to protect the most vulnerable among us—the children, who might otherwise be abused or, certainly, neglected.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation and to stand up firmly on the side of our most vulnerable citizens.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### USAID BRANDING MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 369, H.R. 2744.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2744) to authorize the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to prescribe the manner in which programs of the agency are identified overseas, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "USAID Branding Modernization Act".*

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR BRANDING.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this section as "USAID"), in coordination with the Secretary of State, as appropriate, and with due consideration for the safety and security of implementing partners and beneficiaries, is authorized to prescribe, as appropriate, the use of logos or other insignia of the USAID Identity, or the use of additional or substitute markings, including the United States flag, to appropriately identify, including as required by section 641 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2401), overseas programs administered by USAID.

(b) *AUDIT.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of USAID shall submit to Congress an audit of compliance with relevant branding and marking requirements of USAID by implementing partners funded by USAID, including any requirements prescribed pursuant to the authorization under subsection (a).

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 2744), as amended, was passed.

#### WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR., DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HEADQUARTERS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the