

Maryland

Maryland Respite Care Coalition.

Mississippi

Mississippi Family Caregiver Coalition.

Montana

Developmental Educational Assistance program (DEAP), Montana Lifespan Respite Coalition.

Nebraska

Nebraska Caregiver Coalition, Nebraska Lifespan Respite Network.

Nevada

Nevada Lifespan Respite Care Coalition.

New Jersey

The Family Resource Network, Caregivers of New Jersey.

New York

Fulton Co Office for Aging & Youth, Livable Communities Caregiver Collaborative, Livable Communities Alzheimer's/Dementia Collaborative, Livable Communities Intergenerational Collaborative, New York State Caregiving and Respite Coalition.

Oklahoma

Oklahoma Caregiver Coalition, Sooner Success.

Pennsylvania

Alliance for Community Respite Care.

South Carolina

Central Midlands Area Agency on Aging, Charleston Area Senior Citizens, Inc., Down Syndrome Association of the Upstate, Evolve Senior Solutions, Family Connection of South Carolina, Federation of Families of South Carolina, Leeza's Care Connection, Richland/Lexington Disability and Special Needs Board, South Carolina Autism Society, South Carolina Respite Coalition, South Carolina Spinal Cord Injury Association, Tri-County Adult Day Services, Inc.

Tennessee

Tennessee Respite Coalition.

Washington

Washington PAVE, Washington State Respite Coalition.

Wisconsin

Greater WI Agency on Aging Resources, Inc., Inclusa, Respite Care Association of Wisconsin.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I have shared how important it is that we pass this legislation, the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019, without further delay, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 283, S. 995.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 995) to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, 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 "Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF LIFESPAN RESPIRE CARE PROGRAM.

(a) DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.—Section 2904 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ii-3) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2904. DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State agency awarded a grant or cooperative agreement under section 2902 shall report such data, information, and metrics as the Secretary may require for purposes of—

"(1) evaluating State programs and activities funded pursuant to such grant or cooperative agreement, including any results pursuant to section 2902(d)(2)(B)(xii); and

"(2) identifying effective programs and activities funded pursuant to section 2902.

"(b) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2023, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives regarding the outcomes of the programs and activities funded pursuant to section 2902, including any effective programs and activities identified."

(b) FUNDING.—Section 2905 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ii-4) is amended by striking "title" and all that follows through the period and inserting "title, \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through fiscal year 2024."

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 995), as amended, was passed.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we are running a little bit behind, so I would ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, which reflects the amount of time we are running behind.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate is having yet another debate on legislation to restrict healthcare for women, and I am going to take just a few minutes to talk about what this debate is really all about.

The old Republican slogan was "a chicken in every pot." The new Republican slogan is "a Republican in every examining room."

The Senate has done remarkably little legislating while under the recent control of the other party, but somehow, some way, there always seems to be time to have an attack on women's healthcare. It has come up again and again, and it is always the same basic proposition on offer: Republican politicians trying to somehow squeeze themselves in between women and their physicians.

My view is that the government ought to make sure that women can get healthcare from the doctors they trust and that politicians ought to stay out of things. Roe v. Wade says that is supposed to be the law of the land when it comes to access to abortion. More than four decades of settled law says that these are choices to be made by women and their doctors, and the ideological agendas of politicians ought to have nothing to do with it. The legislation up for debate this week, based on yet another far-right cause, says the opposite. Amongst other problems, one of the proposals on offer this week would actually criminalize the practice of intensely personal healthcare. It would essentially say to doctors: Just throw out your training. Throw it away. Discard your medical judgment, and forget what is in the patient's best interest.

Rightwing politicians are going to call the shots in the exam room. Doctors who provide necessary medical treatment and care that can be life-saving could be thrown in jail if they run afoul of these new ideological government standards.

Now, this isn't a debate just here in the Senate. There have been hundreds of bills brought forward in States across the country restricting women's healthcare, including safe and legal abortion. Among the people hit hardest by these proposals are the millions of women in this country who are every single day walking an economic tight-rope. If they can't see the doctor they trust and if their local Planned Parenthood clinic is forced to shutter its doors because of these harsh new rules, they may not have anywhere else to turn to for vital healthcare. It is another way in which the far right and the Republican agenda supporting it goes back to the days when healthcare was really just for the healthy and the wealthy.

Bottom line: This debate is fundamentally about whether the government gets to control women's bodies. It is a dangerous, in my view, unconstitutional proposition that just throws in the garbage can decades of settled law. This Republican majority has proved that we can always find time here in the Senate to go after women's healthcare with ideological bills, regardless of what other healthcare challenges Americans are facing at home.

I guarantee that across this country right now there are persons lined up at

pharmacy counters with every last penny they have who know they are about to get mugged when it comes to paying for the cost of prescription medicine. Millions of Americans struggle to pay for their medications, but the majority leader of this body has blocked our best efforts to give them a hand. Instead, the Senate is debating yet another ideological attack on women's healthcare that really has no chance of becoming law.

The likelihood is these attacks, in my view, based on what we know, are going to keep coming. It will only get more serious in the months ahead. Four more years of Donald Trump would mean the end of *Roe v. Wade*. It would guarantee more healthcare discrimination against women, and it would mean a whole lot more government control over women's bodies. Again and again, we would see the government in the exam room. I urge my colleagues to reject these proposals when they come up.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative 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 Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from

Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 88, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Bennet	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Harris	Romney
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Booker	Heinrich	Sasse
Boozman	Hoeven	Schatz
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Brown	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Jones	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Shelby
Carper	Kennedy	Sinema
Casey	King	Smith
Cassidy	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Loeffler	Thune
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cruz	Merkley	Warner
Daines	Moran	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wicker
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Enzi	Paul	Young
Ernst	Perdue	
Fischer	Peters	

NAYS—1

Hirono
NOT VOTING—11

Burr	Markey	Sanders
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Feinstein	Murkowski	Warren
Klobuchar	Rubio	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 88, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.
The Senator from Texas.

ABORTION

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today for every child who has been denied the chance to live; the little boys and the little girls who never got the chance to breathe a breath of air, to live life; never got the chance to grow up to be athletes, doctors, poets, or inventors; never got the chance to live their own unique lives.

This year marks the 47th tragic anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court decision that forced on all 50 States abortion on demand and has tragically led to the loss of life of over 60 million unborn children. Since that decision, so much life has been lost. So many unborn and even newborn babies have suffered.

In recent years, we have seen the Democratic Party not listening to the concerns of a great many people of good will on both sides of the party but, rather, radicalize. We have seen leading contenders for the Presidential nomination in the Democratic field declare that pro-life Democrats are no longer welcome in the party. We have seen far too many Democrats embrace extreme positions on abortion—abortion up until the moment of birth and even, horrifically, after that.

I think the radicalization of today's Democratic Party was made crystal clear for a great many Americans with the radio interview that Virginia Governor Ralph Northam did on January 30 of last year. In that interview, Governor Northam was speaking in favor of a bill that would allow abortion when a mother was already in labor.

Stop and think about this for a moment. There have been debates about abortion for a long, long time. A mother in labor, in the process of delivering a child, this bill would allow a doctor to kill that child instead of delivering the child in the midst of labor. For a great many people, even Americans who identify as pro-choice, the idea of killing a child while the mother is in labor delivering the infant is horrifying beyond words. But Governor Northam didn't end there. He wasn't content simply with saying that abortion should be allowed even in the midst of birth. He went further. He said on that radio interview:

The infant would be delivered. The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant 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.

Now, so nobody is lost on what Governor Northam was saying, he was describing something that has euphemistically been called post-birth abortion. He was describing his view of the right way to approach delivering a child, which is a child who is delivered, who is outside the womb, who is breathing and crying and living. That is an infant. And Governor Northam calmly, with virtually no emotion whatsoever, described comforting that infant and then having a conversation about whether to deny that child the necessary care to live or simply to callously let a newborn infant die.

For virtually every American, that is a concept that is so extreme, that is so radical, that—other than elected Democrats who have decided to embrace a radical view of abortion in all circumstances—almost every other American would be, rightly, horrified by the notion of a doctor allowing a newborn infant outside the womb to die. That was Governor Northam's position.

Well, tomorrow the Senate has an opportunity to speak out against those extreme, radical positions, to say this isn't OK, to draw a line, to find what should be some degree of common ground. We are going to be voting on two bills in the Senate tomorrow: the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of both pieces of legislation. Those are both commonsense pieces of legislation that would work to restore fundamental rights for the unborn and for newborn babies. They are simple pieces of legislation.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act requires doctors to provide medical care to infants who survive attempted abortion procedures. It

would help make sure that, when an infant has already been born, when the infant is alive, is breathing, is crying, is outside the womb, that that child receives the medical attention he or she needs.

The second bill is the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act that would ban late-term abortions that result in pain and suffering and agony for an unborn child.

What you will not hear from congressional Democrats is that after 5 months, an unborn child's toes and eyelids and fingers and eyelashes have already formed. He or she has a heartbeat and can feel pain, and science confirms this. We know that these late-term abortions, embraced by more and more radical partisans, produce pain and suffering and agony. We should not be a part of allowing the deliberate infliction of pain on a little girl or a little boy.

These two proposals, in any sane and rational world, would be agreed to unanimously. If you look at the last 3 years, we have seen enormous victories when it has come to defending life, when it has come to confirming 192 new Federal judges committed to following the law in the Constitution; when it has come to restricting taxpayer funding of Planned Parenthood, the largest provider of abortions in this country; when it has come to defending the religious liberties of Americans all across this country, including the Little Sisters of the Poor. We are making major steps in the right direction, but we can go further. We can agree on these commonsense provisions. We can also test whether Senate Democrats agree with their colleagues running for President, whether Senate Democrats agree with the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who has said: If you are a pro-life Democrat, get out of the party; you are not welcome.

I can tell you in Texas, I certainly welcome pro-life Democrats to speak up for their values and defend their values, and we should come together behind commonsense propositions that say we should not be committing procedures that result in pain and agony and suffering, that science demonstrates causes that suffering, and we should not be allowing newborn infants to die because medical care is denied to those children.

This should bring us together. I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand together for life—every life, as a precious, unique gift from God. Every life, whether the child has a disability, whether the child is valued or not, that child should be valued, should be protected because that child is precious.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it must be a day that ends in "Y" because, once again, Republican Senators are pushing for backward, ideological

bills to restrict a women's constitutional right to abortion. Once again, Republicans are peddling a ban that is blatantly unconstitutional. Once again, they are pretending we don't already have laws on the books that protect infants and are using that as a pretext to drum up fear and misunderstanding about one of the most heart-breaking situations a family can face, and are pushing for anti-doctor, anti-women, anti-family legislation.

Once again, I am here on behalf of women and men across the country to deliver the same message we have already made clear countless times: not on our watch. Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has indicated he wants to pivot to legislating, which makes these two atrocious bills an interesting choice because all 100 Senators know they are going absolutely nowhere. The truth is, Republicans' charade today is not actually about passing laws any more than it is about people's health or medical science or what is best for patients. It is really about Republicans' crass political calculation that they can fire up their far-right base with an all-out war against the constitutionally protected right to safe, legal abortion.

The two bills differ in some significant ways, but they have the same consequences. They would criminalize—criminalize—abortion, take deeply personal, often painful decisions out of the hands of parents and use scare tactics and misinformation to try to weaken strong public support for Roe.

Another thing they have in common? They have already been panned by leading medical groups. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has called one of these bills "an unconstitutional attempt to intimidate health care providers and prevent them from providing the safe care their patients want and need." And they have said the other is "a gross legislative interference into the practice of medicine."

It is not just medical experts. Families across the country have actually faced these decisions, have spoken out to make clear politicians should have no part in them. Pressing for these awful bills year after year may be nothing more than a cynical political tactic for Republicans, but passing them would be an unconscionable exercise in cruelty to the people who would actually be affected:

People like Judy, who is from my home State of Washington. Judy learned over 20 weeks into her pregnancy that her son's organs were not developing properly. One lung was 20 percent formed. The other was missing entirely.

People like Kate, whose doctor informed her that if her daughter survived birth, she would not be able to walk, talk, or swallow and likely would not even be comfortable enough to sleep.

People like Lindsay, who learned her daughter had a fast-growing, inoper-

able tumor growing into her brain and heart and lungs, wrapping around her neck and eyes and chest, and making her odds of survival incredibly slim.

People like Darla, who was pregnant with twins when she got the unthinkable news that one of her twins had serious medical complications. Not terminating that pregnancy could put her other twin's healthcare at risk.

Those are just a few of many stories. There are more families across the country who have struggled with the painful reality that the child they have hoped for cannot survive. Each of them has spoken out to underscore that in those wrenching moments, they wanted to make the decision that was best for their child and their family, with their healthcare provider. But each of these bills would take the ability to make the decision best for that child and family away from women like Judy, Kate, Lindsay, and Darla. Those bills would prevent doctors from offering the best medical advice, all because extreme politicians are more concerned with spreading misinformation and firing up their base than they are with actual women's lives. In other words, in the most private moments of personal tragedy, these bills would take precedence over a family's wishes as they grieve.

To the politicians supporting these bills, I have to ask: How dare you think your opinion is more important here than the knowledge of medical experts and the wishes of the family who is affected?

I don't understand how anyone can think, instead of letting patients make their own very personal decisions, that they should have that decision made for them by President Trump and Vice President PENCE. That is exactly what we are talking about today. Why? Even though *Roe v. Wade* has been the law of the land for almost a half a century, even though a large majority of people do not want to see that landmark decision overturned, Republicans think somehow they can benefit politically and fire up the most ideological elements of their base by using every tool imaginable to chip away at the right to safe—safe—legal abortion.

I am here to say they can try, but women, medical experts, and those of us elected officials who trust them are not going to stop calling these bills what they are: anti-women, anti-doctor, and anti-family. We are going to make clear we oppose every single one of their efforts to further chip away at access to safe, legal abortion under *Roe*: every extreme, cruel abortion ban, every fearmongering effort to gin up controversy and pretend we don't already protect infants, every far-right judge they try to pack onto the courts to chip away at *Roe v. Wade*, every barrier to care and information like President Trump's title X gag rule, and every new shameful scheme they concoct in their all-out war on access to reproductive healthcare.

Whatever Republicans try next, Democrats are going to continue fighting alongside women and men across the country to protect their ability to make their own decisions about their own families, continue standing up for doctors' ability to practice medicine without politicians getting in the way, and lifting up the stories of real people, like Judy and Kate and Lindsey, Darla, and many others—so Republicans can't ignore them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am really disappointed to feel like I need to come to the floor today to respond to these anti-women, anti-family bills that have been introduced. Not only would these bills interfere with a woman's ability to make her own reproductive choices, they would threaten doctors with prison time if they perform abortion services that women have a constitutional right to receive.

These bills are dangerous, extreme, and they are part of an ongoing effort by this administration to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. We don't need this legislation to prevent the killing of infants.

Let's be very clear. Infanticide is already illegal under Federal law. In fact, prosecutions have occurred under the current law that prevents infanticide. This legislation would do nothing but set up ambiguous standards for cases that are often medical emergencies and add uncertainty to laws that are already on the books to prohibit infanticide.

This uncertainty will have a chilling effect on the ability of women to access the services they need in the United States. The legislation we are voting on would also imprison doctors for up to 5 years for performing abortions after a woman is 20 weeks pregnant, even though—even though Federal courts have ruled that this 20-week abortion ban, as is proposed under one of these bills, would violate the Constitution.

The 20-week abortion ban bill would only allow for exceptions for minors who are victims of rape or incest if those young women report that rape or incest to the police. For adult women, the rape exception would only apply if she waits 48 hours and gets counseling from a healthcare provider that her government—not that she or her family but the government—determines is acceptable.

These exceptions are just shameful because my colleagues know, as I do, that almost three-quarters of rape and sexual assaults are never reported, often because women have legitimate fears of being victimized again. They fear the rapist or the person who has assaulted them.

More broadly, it is really this simple: We should not be putting doctors in prison for providing a woman with the reproductive care she chooses. We must always remember that abortions that are performed later in pregnancy are

almost always done as a result of severe fetal diagnoses and the serious risk that the pregnancy poses to the life of the woman.

This isn't a decision that any woman or family wants to be in a position to make. It is tragic, and it is heart-breaking. The fact that these bills would demean the women who have to make these decisions by suggesting that this is something that government should decide for them instead of the woman with her family and with her doctor is nothing but tragic. I don't understand how people can think the government is better positioned to make these personal decisions than women and families and their doctors.

Protecting pregnant women, new mothers, and children is about more than scoring political points with anti-choice legislation. It is about ensuring that women have access to maternity care. That means prenatal care. It means having access to affordable healthcare coverage. That is why this legislation rings so hollow. People who are speaking on the floor who are supporting these bills are not talking about improving the lives of women and children.

Right now, this administration is in court, backing a lawsuit that would tear down the Affordable Care Act despite the fact that there is no alternative if the ACA is struck down. If the administration and States succeed in striking down the Affordable Care Act, we are going to go back to the days when insurance companies can exclude maternity care from coverage and when women can be charged higher premiums than men. If they succeed, the Medicaid expansion would be gone, and States would have fewer dollars to cover more people at a time when 43 percent of childbirths in this country are covered and paid for by Medicaid.

These are the fundamental issues that are at stake for women and families across this country. Given these stakes, I am disappointed that here we are again, debating two anti-choice bills that the Senate already rejected in 2018 and 2019. Nothing has changed since then. This is time that is being used, as the Senator from Washington said, just to try and stir up the base of some of the Senators who are in this Chamber.

If my colleagues were serious about protecting mothers and children, they would join in supporting efforts to ensure that the healthcare coverage that families rely on isn't ripped away in court. I urge my colleagues to oppose these bills and to vote no when they are considered on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

RUSSIA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor today with a sense of urgency. Our next national election is a little more than 8 months away. We know from public reporting that Russia is back to its 2016 playbook and

working to interfere again. What some called a political Pearl Harbor in 2016 is in the process of happening again. It is happening to us again.

I notice that every Member of the Senate has Washington's Farewell Address. It is an annual ritual in which that address is read by Members. It is interesting, in the introduction, that one of the things Washington warned about is interference by foreign powers in the Nation's domestic affairs; George Washington, President, one of the Founders of our country, wrote back then about the interference of foreign powers in our domestic affairs.

This isn't about the Kremlin helping Donald Trump, although we know that was their preference the last time. But it has become increasingly clear that at least at this point, chaos is the true goal. We haven't seen anything that may have changed what their preference was 4 years ago. Nothing that the President has done should be a reason for them not to want to see him be reelected again. But regardless of whether that is or is not the case, chaos is part of their goal. Rendering our democracy incapable of standing up to bullies abroad is their goal.

What is this administration's response? Is it paralysis? No, it is anything but. This administration now appears to be engaged in a proactive strategy to deny this body access to information on this interference. With the appointment of Ric Grenell to serve as Acting Director of National Intelligence, the administration is sending a clear message to the American people, to the Congress, and to governments around the world that our intelligence services are now political commodities to be manipulated and used to gain electoral advantage. Amid all of the oversight challenges we face with this administration, we will likely look back on this decision as perhaps one of the most consequential and most damaging to our democratic institutions, and that is saying a lot about this White House.

These reports of Russian interference do not come as a surprise. They should not find us flatfooted. Several of us have introduced sanctions legislation that would deter such Russian behavior from happening. The DASKA bill that I introduced with Senator GRAHAM had broad bipartisan support and passed out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with a strong bipartisan vote and is waiting on the Senate floor for action.

What are we waiting for? The election is 8 months away. What are we waiting for? We are waiting for responsible Senators to defend our democracy, waiting for a vote. Yet it sits here, and it is an outrage.

Inaction at this very precarious stage in our democratic story violates the very oath that Members swore to uphold upon their election. Inaction by this body at this time is truly unimaginable. Yet here we are with this lack of will to stand up for our national security, this lack of will to defend our

democratic institutions, this lack of will to fulfill the oath to our country. History will not judge well the Senate in this hour.

Only Americans should decide American elections—no one else, no foreign power, no foreign player, no foreign individual. Only Americans should decide American elections. I think that is a pretty simple proposition, but it is a powerful one.

Our legislation and others are not the only tools available to the President. If he decided to stand up for our democratic institutions, existing CAATSA legislation includes several sanction mandates already on the books that could be used. Obama and Trump era Executive orders are sitting on the shelf, gathering dust. Both could be employed right this minute to impose crippling sanctions on Russia to send a clear message: Do not mess with our elections or there are serious consequences.

But what is the message from this White House in response to public reporting that Russia is again interfering? Is it following the laws that Congress has passed, full implementation of CAATSA, crippling sanctions on the Kremlin, full activation of all the powers involved and Executive orders? No, no. Instead, the President decided to fire the guy who delivered the news to Congress and replace him with a political sycophant. This would be like FDR dismissing the congressional declaration of war after Pearl Harbor and firing members of his staff who reported on the Japanese attack. It is pretty astounding.

Never before have we had a President so transparently willing to bow down to a foreign foe, unwilling to challenge in the collective national interest and security of the United States, in the collective democracy of our country. The core of our democracy is citizen participation in casting a vote to decide who governs them, from the President to the Congress, to local States and mayors. When that is eroded by the engagement of a foreign government—a foreign government that is nefarious in its activities and consequential in its actions—it undermines the very essence of our democracy.

I don't care who they are helping. They are supposedly helping, according to the press reports, Senator SANDERS as well. That is wrong. I don't want them helping anybody in our country. I don't want them engaged on behalf of anyone in our country.

Never before have I seen a President unwilling to challenge Putin and Russia. Never before have I seen a President so willing to sacrifice national security for his own political gain. And every single Member in this body who does not stand up and hold him to account and try to make sure that we pass legislation and challenge the President to ultimately sign it and enact it and to pursue the law as it is already on the books in terms of CAATSA, to pursue the Executive

order powers that exist today—which would send an incredibly powerful message if invoked—is complicit. We will have to bear the judgment of history. I expect the judgment will be rather harsh.

For myself, I am going to do everything possible to ensure that our elections are sacrosanct and that they do not have the interference of a foreign power. I do not want to be among those whom history is going to judge very harshly for being silent in the face of an invasion of information and efforts to undermine our elections. In any other context, we would consider it a war. I consider it no less.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my Senate colleagues.

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

ABORTION

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, we are here today to discuss two pieces of legislation that will be voted on tomorrow in the U.S. Senate. These two important bills address the issue of life, a most basic human right—the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

This first bill, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, would end the barbaric practice of late-term abortions after 5 months. It is a time, in fact, that the science tells us that babies feel pain.

The second bill, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, will protect babies who are born alive after surviving botched abortions.

These back-to-back votes will present an opportunity for every Senator and, more specifically, for nearly every one of the Senate Democrats to show the American people whether they believe there are any—any—limits to radical abortion practices.

I am joined this evening by several of my esteemed Senate colleagues and good friends: Senator ERNST of Iowa, Senator SASSE of Nebraska, and Senator BRAUN of Indiana. These folks, like me, know how important it is that we protect the sanctity of life and put an end to the cruel practice of late-term abortions and the horrific act of infanticide.

I founded the Senate Pro-Life Caucus last year because I believe the U.S. Senate needed to take bolder action to protect human life.

In fact, at the State of the Union Address, President Trump invited Ellie Schneider and her mother, from Missouri, as his guests. Ellie's mother

stood proudly as the President shared their story and the miracle it was that Ellie was with us that night, healthy and thriving.

You see, Ellie was born at 21 weeks and 6 days. In fact, she is one of the youngest premature babies to survive in the United States. Despite the odds being stacked against her, Ellie was given a chance at life. Thanks to the grace of God, she is alive and she is healthy today.

Ellie's story and the stories of so many others like her underscore how important it is that we put an end to this very cruel practice of late-term abortion. It is heartbreaking to know that here in America—in the United States of America—nearly 12,000 children a year are lost to late-term abortions.

At 20 weeks, science tells us, these babies can suck their thumbs. They can feel pain. They can yawn. They can stretch. They can make faces.

In fact, if you have a smartphone, if you are watching tonight, just Google 20weekbaby—2-0-W-E-E-K-B-A-B-Y.

Here is one of the images that will show up on your smartphone. That is what a 20-week baby looks like.

It is unconscionable that preborn babies, after 5 months of pregnancy, can be killed, even though they are capable of feeling pain.

In fact, during this age, preborn babies are oftentimes given anesthesia if there is fetal surgery involved.

Now, here is one of the shocking statistics. The United States is only one of seven—seven—countries in the world, which include North Korea and China, that allow these barbaric late-term abortions after 20 weeks. That is a list we don't want to be on, but we are. As Americans, we must strive for better. This isn't political. This is about working to ensure that every single child has a chance at life.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a commonsense bill and has overwhelming public support. Do you realize public attitude and opinion on abortion and late-term abortion keeps swinging in the pro-life direction? Why is that?

Well, perhaps one reason is because technology has gotten so much better, and 3D ultrasounds give us such a clear picture of what is happening there in the womb.

Look at this picture right here. The images are very clear. I believe in a principle that people believe what they discover for themselves. Technology is helping young people see that what we are talking about here is a baby. It is life.

Sixty-two percent of voters oppose late-term abortion. This bill is something that I firmly believe every Republican and every Democrat can get behind. Why can't we at least come together on late-term abortion and banning it? Passing this bill would be a major step forward for the pro-life cause.

The next bill we are voting on tomorrow is the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Back home in Montana, this piece of legislation moved through our State legislature up to our Governor's desk. It was called the "Baby Born Alive" bill. It is the same thing. It mandates that if a baby is born alive following a botched abortion, the doctor must protect that baby and give the same medical care that any other baby would receive.

Is that really too much to ask for? Honestly, the fact that we are having this debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate is astonishing. The American people agree. In fact, 77 percent of pro-abortion advocates believe that babies born alive should be medically protected.

Sadly, today there are States that do not offer protections for babies born alive. In fact, just earlier this month, in Colorado, State legislators killed a bill that would grant legal protections for babies born alive after abortions.

I would like to turn to my colleague from Iowa, Senator JONI ERNST. She has been an unwavering, relentless champion for life, and she has been a dear friend. She is a great colleague and a great leader on this issue of protecting the most vulnerable—these little babies.

Senator ERNST, would you agree with me that Senate Democrats should join us in voting for these commonsense bills that protect innocent human life?

Ms. ERNST. Absolutely, Senator DAINES, and I am proud to join you on the floor for this colloquy this evening. I will take your place, and I have just a few words that I would love to share on these bills as well and protecting our unborn.

Again, I would like to thank the Senator from Montana for arranging this colloquy.

We want to get into some of these commonsense measures that we are speaking about this evening. I appreciate the Senator from Montana's words, and it is astounding that we are even having this debate on the floor of the Senate.

Very, very commonsense, lifesaving measures are coming before us this week, and, first, I would like to step back a little bit and take a moment to answer the one key, big-picture question at the center of this debate and the debate that we have over life, and the basic question there: Is life valuable? And my answer to that question is absolutely.

I see value in every single life, and we all have different ideas on how we measure the value of life, but I can boil it down a little bit. Some folks would say it is what a human being will bring to this world. Now, what that is can be determined by different measures, but what impact does a person have.

Now, some, of course, will see celebrities. They will see athletes. They will see trailblazers and scientists and say: Wow, they have made their mark on the world, and they contribute so much. There is so much impact there.

But then I see it in everyday, common people at home in Iowa, as well. I

even reflect upon folks like a friend of my daughter's who grew up in our small community of Stanton. He has Down syndrome, and yet he contributed so much—and still does to this day—in our home community. He is our hometown spirit coordinator at every football game, and he is leading everyone in their cheers and supporting our hometown teams. And this young man brings so much joy to everyone. I would say that his life has made a huge impact on all who know him. We can think of the smallest among us as well, that baby in the womb, and how does that baby make an impact. As a mother, I know that fellow mothers can relate to this as well, but that baby makes an impact even in the womb. The experience of pregnancy can change a woman forever, not just physically but mentally and emotionally.

Women I talk to will often comment on the amazing feeling and bond they will have with that child who is growing in their womb. They experience that heartbeat in the womb. And even to the effects that maybe we don't like to reflect on—I remember the swollen ankles I had in the last month of pregnancy. No offense to Fred Flintstone, but I had Fred Flintstone feet. Even things like that we can reflect on. But the impact of having that child stays with me. It changed me forever.

I know that other mothers know that whether it is from the beginning of a pregnancy with a healthy, full-term child or whether it is a scary premature birth or, for some, the difficult and life-ending decision to abort, the fact remains that the tiny human being carried within us has forever left a mark on their mother. This truth spurs me on to fight even harder to protect the undeniable value that every human life has. Every human life has value.

So today I stand with my pro-life colleagues in asking our pro-choice friends—many of whom are mothers and fathers themselves—to meet us in the middle. We may not be able to get on the same page when it comes to recognizing the inherent value each of these lives holds, but surely we can agree that protecting our most vulnerable from painful death is a unifying and humanitarian cause.

What I would like to do is just tell you the story of my fellow Iowan, Micah Pickering. Micah is joining us on the Hill this week, and I encourage all of my colleagues to take some time to meet this incredible boy. He will be on the Hill tomorrow.

When I first met Micah, he was just a couple years old, and his family had brought him into my office. I had this picture. I had just this picture in my office. Micah, then 2 years old, ran over to this picture, not knowing it was he, and he pointed at it and he said: "A baby!"

I started to cry, and I said: "Yes, Micah, that is a baby."

Today Micah is happy, healthy, and he is 7 years old. He was born at 22

weeks, and that is the age of some of the babies we are talking about today—born at 22 weeks. When Micah was born, he was literally the size of a bag of M&Ms, a tiny baby.

Folks, can't we all agree that this is a baby and that babies like Micah who survive a premature birth at 20 to 22 weeks—we are talking about those who survive at 20 weeks, which is more than halfway through pregnancy—are deserving of protection? I agree with that.

The only difference between Micah and the more than 10,000 children who are aborted after 22 weeks' gestation—which is what Micah was—the difference, the dividing factor, is that Micah was wanted by his parents. His parents, Danielle and Clayton, saw his inherent value.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a measure that should meet the approval standard of my pro-choice friends because supporting this bill means giving all of the Micah Pickerings of the world an equal, fighting chance. The degree to which a child of any age is wanted does not diminish their value, and we have an obligation as lawmakers to protect their right to life.

But if we cannot come together in support of a bill that protects viable babies from abortion at the point when they feel pain, then surely, surely a baby who survives an abortion attempt deserves the same degree of care as any other newborn. Folks, just think about it. These babies, their lives—they have already survived a horrific abortion attempt and have been given a second chance at life. But without our putting the necessary protections in place, these precious babies can literally be left to die. Those in the medical field who fail to care for these precious newborns need to be held accountable.

Senator SASSE has helped lead the way in protecting these living babies with his Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a commonsense bill that I proudly support. Given that we have an estimated 143 babies who died between 2003 and 2014 after surviving abortion, it is clear that we need to strengthen the current law. These babies deserve the basic medical standard of care regardless of how wanted they may have been.

I implore you to think about the issue of life in a new way, one that is very simple. When you think about everyone you have come into contact with, whether it is your family, your friends, your coworkers, your spouse, even yourself, every single person was at one time a defenseless child in their mother's womb. Every life, from the baby who has just been conceived, to each and every one of you in this room tonight, has value. Whether you are that star athlete, whether you are that scientist making new discoveries, whether you are that hometown cheerleader, every life has value.

To my Senate colleagues, we have had this debate before, but I ask that

you consider these bills with new eyes focused on the inherent value of life. You have the opportunity to save lives, and I hope you will join me in doing so.

I thank the Senator from Montana for raising this issue this evening, and I am proud to be a “yes” vote on both of these tremendous bills. I hope we can get others to join us in that effort.

Thank you, Senator.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DAINES. Senator, thank you, and thanks for your very moving story about Micah Pickering. It helps to take these ideas and translate them directly into these children today, whom you can see there as a little baby.

There are critics of the born-alive bill who would say this horrible act that we described here tonight simply doesn't happen. For those who say that, they should talk to somebody named Melissa Oden. In fact, just last year when we had the born-alive bill on the floor of the Senate, I was coming down to speak on behalf of the bill. I was just about maybe 50 feet from where I am standing right now, outside the doors of the Senate, as I was making my way to speak, and guess who was standing outside the door of the Senate. It was Melissa Oden. She is a beautiful mother today. She survived a saline-infusion abortion as a little baby at about 5 months. She was left for dead, and she was discarded—this was in Kansas City, MO—until a hospital nurse heard her little cries. This nurse saved Melissa's life, for which we are very thankful. It was quite an experience to meet her just outside these Chamber doors. Now Melissa herself is a mother.

I believe we have a duty, an obligation to protect life and particularly the most innocent life and the most vulnerable life, like a little baby who can be born alive as a result of a botched abortion attempt.

It is my hope that the Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats, will vote to support and defend this most basic human right and recognize that late-term abortions—I recognize this is a very divisive issue in this country, but I would think that on the issue of late-term abortions, on the issue of babies born alive as a result of botched abortions—can we at least come together where public opinion overwhelmingly supports both and say, let's stop these barbaric practices. These are extreme positions. They should be outlawed in this country. We can no longer simply stand by as our children—we talk about children in this country losing their lives to abortion and infanticide.

As Americans, we have an obligation to honor our Nation's founding promise enshrined in our Declaration of Independence that all men and all women and all human life are created equal and endowed by our Creator with these certain inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Think about it this way: Of these important rights, you can't have liberty and the

pursuit of happiness without first having the right to life. This right to life is the first and most important of these inalienable rights.

So I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting these commonsense bills to stop this brutal violence of late-term abortions of pain-capable babies. That is why it is called the Pain-Capable Act. Babies are capable of feeling pain at about 20 weeks. That is why, when in utero surgery is performed, they administer anesthesia—because the baby is feeling pain. That is where we are drawing the line with these bills to stop late-term abortion and also babies who are born alive—which isn't about abortion; this is about infanticide. We must protect these innocent babies, standing for life, standing for those who are most vulnerable.

I see that my colleague from Nebraska, Senator SASSE, has come to the floor. Senator SASSE authored the baby born alive bill. I am grateful Senator SASSE is joining us here tonight in this colloquy.

Senator SASSE, can you explain the importance of passing the bill you have authored?

Mr. SASSE. Thank you, Senator DAINES of Montana and Senator ERNST of Iowa. I know Senator BRAUN is going to be here shortly. I want to speak about both pieces of legislation we are going to be considering tomorrow. Both of them are very important to distinguish. I know it has been brought up a few times tonight, but just to be sure we are all on the same page, Senator GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a very important piece of legislation, and I think my Born-Alive Abortion Survivor's Protection Act—both of them, which my colleagues here have spoken on, are very important pieces of legislation. They are important pieces of legislation, but they are distinct and have to be clarified to the American people, via the press, on how they differ.

These two bills are different, but they are connected by a simple question, which is, Will the Senate vote tomorrow to protect babies? This is about as straightforward a question as you can possibly have. Will the Senate vote tomorrow to protect babies?

Let's talk first about Senator GRAHAM's legislation. Every mom and dad knows what it is like to see your child hurt, to see somebody fall down, maybe with something as minor as a scraped knee or a burnt hand on the stove or a finger slammed in a car door or a bedroom door. You know that experience of a deep breath that is going to be followed by the piercing cry. Something drops in the pit of your stomach. Every parent knows this feeling. You want to scoop them up. You want to grab them. You want to hold them, and you want to take away the pain. You would take Tenex for the pain, if you could, to protect your baby from that pain. You want to make it stop, and you want them to know that they are going to be okay. When your child hurts, you hurt,

and it is far worse to watch your child hurting than to feel the pain yourself.

So we have this gut feeling when it comes to pain. When we see someone hurting, we know this is not the way the world is supposed to be. Pain is not natural. This is not the order of things as it was meant to be, and so our heart leaps at the sight of someone in pain—not just a child, but especially when it is a child, a family member, or a friend, or even a complete stranger. When you see somebody in pain, we want to make it stop. Human beings are compassionate; that is, we feel along with others. When they suffer, we suffer, and so we reach out to protect. We want to give comfort.

Tomorrow, we have the opportunity to extend that reach of care and comfort and protection. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would protect babies as early as 20 weeks into pregnancy—that is halfway through—by inscribing in law our responsibility to protect innocent babies in the womb from the pain that is inflicted by abortion.

The responsibility that we have when a 2-year-old skins her knee is also a responsibility that we have when a 20-week-old baby in the womb is threatened. The science is clear: Modern medicine is allowing surgeons to perform operations on in utero babies, and these intricate, amazing—amazing—little operations available nowadays are saving the lives of thousands of babies with what would have once been fatal conditions. These surgeons frequently administer drugs to the baby, just like they do to the mother. These doctors are treating two patients—not just one—and they do everything in their power not just to advance the health of both of the patients but to protect both of the patients from pain. They want to be sure that both patients are safe and comfortable and as well cared for as possible.

Science has shown us that these babies feel pain, and the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a simple recognition that, although the baby in the womb might be mostly invisible to us, we are not blind to her needs. We have a responsibility to spread that umbrella of law over every vulnerable person, no matter how small. Size doesn't determine dignity or worth.

The question before us tomorrow is, Will the U.S. Senate vote to protect these babies? It is pretty simple. You are going to hear lots of crazy commentary talking about other stuff than what we are actually voting on tomorrow, but what we are voting on is, Should the U.S. Senate vote to protect these babies? I plan to vote in favor of compassion because I believe that being pro-mom and pro-baby and being pro-science are all bundled up together. So tomorrow, we are going to consider compassionate pro-science and pro-baby legislation, and I implore my colleagues, all 100 of us, ought to be doing the same.

I also know that, although I am unapologetically pro-life, many of my

colleagues in this body are not. So tonight, I also want us to talk about a different piece of legislation. It is motivated by that same care and that same concern with having the U.S. Senate vote to protect babies. It is actually a different piece of legislation than Senator GRAHAM's important pro-life anti-abortion piece of legislation. I want to talk about this second piece of legislation.

Even if you are unwilling to vote to defend unborn babies, I hope that my colleagues would at least consider joining with us in voting to protect babies that have already been born. Senator GRAHAM's legislation is about protecting babies in utero. We have got a second piece of legislation before us tomorrow that is about protecting babies after they have already been born.

Will we acknowledge that a baby outside the womb should not be left to die? That is what the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is actually about. One year ago tomorrow, the U.S. Senate, sadly, shamefully, shrugged its shoulders at babies who had already been born after botched abortions. A bipartisan majority in this body—let's be clear—a bipartisan majority voted in favor of protecting these babies, but we didn't have enough votes. We didn't have enough votes voting with us in this Chamber to break the filibuster in favor of infanticide. That is what happened a year ago tomorrow in this Chamber.

Today, there is nothing in our Federal law that criminalizes the denial of care to a baby that has survived an abortion, so when a baby lives through an abortion procedure and ends up born and is outside mom, there is nothing in Federal law that criminalizes denying care to those babies and allowing her or him to die, and we have to change that.

This second bill tomorrow is not actually about abortion. It is not about *Roe v. Wade*. It is about something different. It is about what happens after an abortion that didn't succeed in terminating the baby's life. When a baby survives and is lying on that table cold and naked and alone, what does our society do? Are we a country that protects babies that are alive—born outside the womb after having survived a botched abortion—are we a country that says it is okay to just sit back and allow that baby to die? That baby that is fighting for life, is it okay for us to just let that baby die? It is a plain and simple question, and we all know what the right answer is. There are hard calls that we consider in this body sometimes. There are a lot of gray issues. This isn't one of them. This isn't a hard call.

Since last year's vote, we have brought before this body testimony from medical experts who have been involved in abortion procedures and who have had in their hands 1-pound little babies that had survived abortions. That was the purpose of the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearing on this

bill 2 weeks ago. In that, we heard testimony that made clear why this bill is necessary, and it made clear that the other side actually can't confront the arguments head on. That is what happened 2 weeks ago in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

We were looking at the text of this bill. We had in front of us medical experts who had the experience with people who had babies who had survived abortions, and they talked about what happened in their clinics. Everybody who spoke against the Abortion Survivors Protection Act didn't talk about the bill at all. They talked about all these other things. Some of them aren't actually hard debates, but none of them had anything to do with the legislation that we were actually considering. That is because they couldn't actually defend opposing a bill that the purpose is simply to prohibit infanticide.

That is why Planned Parenthood, NARAL, and the Big Abortion doctors' lobby resorted to simple misinformation. That is all the hearing was by those who were opposed to the legislation. They say that what we are trying to do is prevent something that doesn't happen. That is not true. That is a myth. There are 8 States where we have some reporting information. We should have reporting information from all 50 States, but in the 8 States that we have, we have information about the babies that survive abortions and what happens to them. They wouldn't confront those facts, so they just made these blanket statements that this legislation deals with something that doesn't happen, but it does, which is why we had a hearing and why we brought in experts.

Then the opponents of this legislation talked about completely unrelated things. They said that there are no such things as abortion survivors. We would like to introduce you to some of them. Perhaps they should also consult the CDC's records. Of the several States I mentioned, there were eight that reported data on survivors.

Or they should talk to the Abortion Survivors Network. They should look into the eyes of spouses and friends and neighbors and coworkers and parents who are abortion survivors, and they should try to tell them that what we are doing is pointless or a waste. They can't do that because their position is morally indefensible.

Who are the spouses and friends and neighbors who are not here today because they did not receive lifesaving medical care in their first moments of life? The terms of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act are simple: A child born alive during a botched abortion would be given the same level of care that is provided to any other baby born at that same gestational stage. That is it. That is all the second piece of legislation we are going to deal with tomorrow does.

It says, when a baby survives an abortion, that baby should get the

same level of medical care that is provided to any other baby at the same stage of gestational development. That is all it does. It doesn't create, as opponents charge, some mandate to prolong the suffering of a dying child. It doesn't do anything like that. It simply says, if a baby survives an abortion, it has to get the same level of medical care that would be provided to any other baby at the same stage of gestational care that had parents that wanted that baby. It doesn't force the doctor to do anything that violates medical best practice. It simply says that a baby who survives an abortion is a baby and should be treated as such, as a baby, with care and compassion.

Do Senators in this Chamber believe their own campaign slogans? Our colleague from Vermont, who is on the verge of becoming the standard-bearer for the Democratic Party in our country, has declared: "The mark of a great Nation is how it treats its most vulnerable people."

Senator SANDERS is right. America is dedicated to the proposition that all men and women, all boys and girls, are created equal—even the littlest ones, even if they happen to come into the world in the most horrific of circumstances and even if they are crippled or inconvenient or unwanted. America recognizes the immeasurable dignity of every human being, regardless of race or sex or creed or ability. If we are hemming and hawing about whether it is okay to let children die of neglect, we know we have lost part of our soul.

Tomorrow, we have a chance to recognize and secure the dignity of some of the most vulnerable members of our society. We have a chance to protect those babies who come into the world under the worst of conditions, and we have the chance to extend to them the possibility of life and of love. Tomorrow, we can speak up for the voiceless. We can defend the defenseless. We can come to the aid of the innocent.

This is not about *Roe*. This is not about politics. It is about a simple question: Will the U.S. Senate, tomorrow, stand for the proposition that babies are babies and they deserve care? Will the Senate vote tomorrow to protect babies?

I defer to my colleague from the State to the east, Iowa, Senator ERNST.

Ms. ERNST. I thank Mr. SASSE, the great Senator from Nebraska. I want to thank him for joining the colloquy and for offering the bill that would save these babies that, as he described, are born in horrific circumstances. But a baby is a baby, and it is undeniable.

I do hope that we have a number of our friends and colleagues from across the aisle join us tomorrow in that vote and say that, yes, this is a life that deserves dignity and a chance and an opportunity. That is what we are asking for. So thank you very much for your work there.

We will continue our colloquy. We have another speaker that is joining us

from the great State of Indiana. I will yield to the junior Senator.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, a little over a month ago—or a year ago—I was here with Senator SASSE and asked for a unanimous consent vote. I was here, mostly curious to see who might object to a bill that wants born alive—where you do everything you can to keep that child alive. I was appalled then, and here again, we are talking about the same thing, but I think we have got room for optimism.

We have got two bills that have gotten, I think, more support at this stage of the game than in a long time. First on the Pain Capable bill, last month, two researchers, with broadly different views on abortion, published research in the *Journal of Medical Ethics*, stating conclusively that “the neuroscience cannot definitely rule out fetal pain before 24 weeks.”

As we continue to learn more about the science of when unborn children can feel pain in the womb, the moral imperative to provide a cutoff point for abortions grows stronger and stronger. I hope that my colleagues, especially on the other side of the aisle, will not deny science by allowing abortions to be performed on unborn children capable of feeling pain.

The Born Alive bill—again, we are closer than ever. On a procedural vote, we have 53 votes, bipartisan, almost there, with 3 Republicans not able to vote. So, theoretically, 56 votes possibly. I stepped up here a year ago, and I do it again because I also sense, across the country, things are starting to change.

Millennials are now leaning towards what the solemnity and sanctity of life is about, and I think, if we just take guidance from that younger generation, it ought to be able to move four Senators to get in line and do what seems to be so clear from a moral point of view.

Some will say that a bill to ensure medical care for babies born after failed abortions is unnecessary because it doesn't happen that often. That is not a good reason. It doesn't matter how common it is. It matters if it is right or wrong. Even if my colleagues do not agree with me that every baby conceived has the right to be born, we should at least agree that every baby that is born has a right to live. If you go back a few years ago, 2015, there were 38 votes for the same bill. In 2017, there were 36. A little over a year ago, there were 53, or 56, however you want to look at it.

I plead to citizens across this country, just as I did a little over a year ago, to get ahold of your Senators. In States where the sanctity of life—the solemnity of life—is important, get ahold of your Senators and tell them that we need their votes.

I yield the floor.

Ms. ERNST. Thank you very much to the junior Senator from Indiana. We really appreciate his efforts on these bills as well.

Again, I think all of us would agree that these are commonsense pieces of legislation, and we would love to see some movement coming from our friends on the left.

We have had a wonderful colloquy this evening.

Of course, again, thanks to the Senator from Montana, Mr. DAINES, for leading this colloquy and for sharing his time with us this evening as we have talked about some of these measures.

To the junior Senator from the great State of Nebraska, as well, Mr. SASSE, thank you so much for authoring the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Act.

And thanks to Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, of course, for authoring his pain-capable bill.

Again, we have talked this evening about those two bills that really hit close to home. I did happen to sit through the Judiciary Committee hearing that was led by Senator SASSE a couple of weeks ago, where we did talk about the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Act. It was true that so many of our friends across the aisle were deflecting on the legislation. They were talking about a woman's right to choose. They were talking about being pro-choice and supporting abortion. The bottom line is, this is not a bill that has anything to do with those topics. This is about saving babies who are born alive after a botched abortion attempt. So I think we have to make that very clear as we move through tomorrow's proceedings.

Again, thank you for the colloquy this evening. It has been very helpful in expressing our views about the rights of these babies to live and to make a difference in our world.

With that, we will close out the colloquy, again thanking those who are supporting the bills, as well as those who joined us here on the floor this evening.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, February 25, the Senate vote on the following: one, confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 384; two, cloture on Executive Calendar No. 491; three, cloture on Executive Calendar No. 569; further, that if cloture is invoked on the nominations and following the third vote in the series, the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. to accommodate the weekly party luncheons; that following the lunch recess, the Senate resume legislative session and consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 3275 and the time from 2:15 p.m. until 3:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 3:30 p.m., cloture on the motions to proceed to S. 3275 and S. 311 ripen and that following the votes on those motions to invoke cloture, the Senate vote on the following: one, confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 491;

two, confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 569; and, three, cloture on Executive Calendar No. 416.

I further ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the Greaves nomination, the vote on confirmation occur at 1:45 p.m. on Thursday, February 27; further, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

LITHUANIAN AND ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAYS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today is Estonia's 102nd Independence Day.

Lithuania celebrated 102 years of continuous statehood on the 16th, and Latvia will in November.

This is significant not just because the Baltic States are close American allies with shared values; it is worth noting because Russia has been waging war on historical truth.

Vladimir Putin recently made the absurd claim that Poland was to blame for World War II.

In 1992, Boris Yeltsin made public the secret annex to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, making it clear that the Nazis and Soviets colluded to carve up Poland and the Baltics.

That also puts to lie the myth that the Baltics “joined” the Soviet Union. The United States recognized them as occupied sovereign states.

We ought to continue to defend their sovereignty as well as historical truth.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to elaborate on my statement of February 13 in support of S. J. Res. 68. This resolution puts the Senate on record with regard to war powers and Iran in the wake of the U.S. strike against Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Commander Qasem Soleimani on January 2, 2020.

The resolution, which directs the President to terminate the use of U.S. Armed Forces for hostilities against Iran, passed the Senate with a strong bipartisan majority. This bipartisan consensus is a testament to Senator KAINE's leadership, and I commend him for that.