If Republicans vote to release their memo of partisan talking points tonight, they should also vote to release the memo prepared by Ranking Member SCHIFF, and let everyone judge both on the merits. Let both memos go forward. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. It would be absolute hypocrisy for House Republicans to release their memo and not allow Representative SCHIFF to release his.

Everyone should keep in mind who is promoting this stuff. Who is promoting these rightwing talking points, defaming the FBI? None other than Russian-linked bots. They are using the hashtag ''Release the Memo'' 100 more times than any other hashtag by Kremlin-linked accounts. Putin and the Kremlin are trying at all times to undermine our democracy through the spread of false information.

What does it say about the Republican memo that the Kremlin is pushing it more than they are pushing anything else right now? At this point, every American should wonder whether the House Republicans are working harder for Putin or for the American people—at least those House Republicans who put together this memo.

This Republican talking points memo is part of a pattern of behavior from this White House and their Republican allies in Congress—not everyone, just some—and the hard-right media. They do not welcome the results of Special Counsel Mueller's investigation, so they are trying to smear the investigation and the entire FBI before it concludes. We all know agents; we all know how hard they work and how decent they are.

The attacks on the credibility of the FBI are beyond the pale. They have fueled wild speculation and outright paranoia—talks of ''coups'' and ''deep states'' and ''secret societies.'' It brings shame on the folks propagating this nonsense, but more crucially, it diminishes our great country.

When prominent voices in one of our country's two major political parties are outright attacking the FBI and the Department of Justice—the pillars of American law enforcement—they are playing right into Mr. Putin's hands. They are unfairly and dishonestly clouding a crucial investigation into Russia's interference in our elections—a matter of most serious concern for every American. It is abhorrent. It must stop.

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 motion to proceed to S. 2311, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Jerry Moran, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Tom Cotton, Joni Ernst, James M. Inhofe, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, James Lankford, Roy Blunt.

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 motion to proceed to S. 2311, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Flake	Perdue
Boozman	Gardner	Portman
Burr	Graham	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Casey	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young

NAYS—46

Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Harris	Murray	
Hassan	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Baldwin	McCain	Nelson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Tim Scott, Todd Young, Richard C. Shelby, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, Jerry Moran, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune.

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 David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Gardner	Murkowski
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Perdue
Burr	Hatch	Portman
Capito	Heitkamp	Risch
Cassidy	Heller	Roberts
Cochran	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott
Cotton	Jones	Shelby
Crapo	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Klobuchar	Thune
Daines	Lankford	Tillis
Donnelly	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	Manchin	Warner
Ernst	McCaskill	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	Young

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hassan	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	

NOT VOTING—2

McCain	Nelson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION BILL

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the United States is just one of seven countries in the entire world that currently allow elective abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, and we are not in good company on that list. Of the other six countries that allow elective abortions at that very late stage of the child's development, half of those countries have authoritarian governments—communist governments with horrible records when it comes to human rights.

Yes, our abortion laws are as extreme and inhumane as the abortion laws in Vietnam, China, and North Korea. It pains me—and it should pain all Americans—that the United States lags so very far behind the rest of the world in protecting the unborn, protecting human beings, simply because they have yet to take their first breath.

Twenty weeks is the fifth month of pregnancy. Think about what that means. At that stage, the unborn child is about 10 inches long from head to toe. He or she is roughly the size of a banana. A baby at this stage sleeps and wakes in the womb. She sucks her thumb, makes faces, and, in some cases, might even see light filtering in through the womb.

By 20 weeks, if not before, science suggests that the baby can also feel pain. Each year in this country, more than 10,000 abortions occur after this point in the baby's development. Today, we have a chance to stop this grave injustice.

Moments ago, this body voted on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, a bill that would prohibit abortions after the 20th week of pregnancy. This is a commonsense restriction that is supported by a majority of Americans. More than 6 in 10 Americans support a ban on abortion after 20 weeks, according to a Marist poll conducted earlier this month. Not only that, but a majority of Democrats—56 percent—said they would support an abortion ban at 20 weeks. Yes, this bill does, in fact, have widespread support, and it would bring America back into the mainstream of nations.

More importantly, this bill is just. It is humane. It is the right thing to do. It is the natural outcome of any question asked with a degree of moral probity: Is this right?

The reason we signed up for this job is to fight for what is right. And it is wrong—self-evidently wrong—that our country allows 5-month-old unborn babies to be killed. We, in this body, have a moral duty to protect those vulnerable human beings, but I have no illusions that this will be easy.

We have to overcome the misinformation of the abortion industry. This is a powerful special interest group that wants to keep abortion legal right up to the moment of birth. The abortion industry is attacking this bill by denying that there is any evidence that unborn babies can feel pain at 20 weeks. The linchpin of its argument is a 2005 study that claimed unborn babies could not feel pain until the 30th week of pregnancy. What the abortion industry never mentions, of course, is that this study was written by individuals with significant and, I would add, undisclosed ties to the abortion industry itself.

As reported by the Philadelphia Inquirer, the study's lead author, who was not a doctor but a medical student, previously worked for NARAL. Another of the study's authors actually performed abortions as the medical director of an abortion clinic.

How convenient that the abortion industry's denial of fetal pain rests on a study by its own employees. If I recall, the tobacco industry tried something similar when they denied that cigarettes cause cancer. As always, the antidote to misinformation is more information, and the antidote to bad science is good science.

I have three studies that address the topic of fetal pain specifically. They were all published after the abortion industry's favorite study—the one they prefer to acknowledge to the exclusion of all others. Unlike that study—the one they prefer to the exclusion of all others—none of these studies are compromised by a conflict of interest.

This one is by the International Association for the Study of Pain. It concludes: ''The available scientific evidence makes it possible, even probable, that fetal pain perception occurs well before late gestation.'' The study pinpoints fetal pain to the ''second trimester'' of pregnancy, ''well before the third trimester.''

Here is another study by the American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists. It concludes that ''the basis for pain perception appear[s] at about 20 to 22 weeks from conception.''

Finally, here is a 2012 study published in the Journal of Maternal-Fetal and Neonatal Medicine. This paper states that there is evidence that unborn children can feel pain beginning at 20 weeks. The authors note that at this stage, unborn children have pain receptors in their skin, recoil in response to sharp objects like needles, and release stress hormones when they are harmed.

They conclude: ''We should suppose that the fetus can feel pain. . . . When the development of the fetus is equal to that of a premature baby.''

I could go on, but I think that is enough for now. The takeaway is this. The science at a minimum suggests that unborn children can feel pain around 20 weeks. It can feel the abortionists' instruments as they do their grisly work.

These children feel until they cannot. That possibility alone—the mere possibility—should be chilling to us, and that possibility alone should have us rushing to ban abortion at 20 weeks. I implore my colleagues who didn't vote for this to reconsider and, the next time they have an opportunity to support it, to vote yes on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

A vote for this bill is a vote to protect some of the most vulnerable members of the human family. And yes, we are talking about members of the human family. The life form we are talking about is not a puppy; it is not some other form of animal. This is a human being we are talking about. This is something that instinctively calls out for us. We think about the needs of the most vulnerable among us, and we should be eager to protect them.

Together, we can move our country's laws away from those of North Korea and China and toward our most fundamental belief that all human beings are created equal and that they have an unalienable right to life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose dangerous legislation that would endanger the health of women by limiting their constitutional right to access a safe and legal abortion. We must recognize the capacity of every woman in our Nation to make her own healthcare decisions, control her own destiny, and ensure that all women have the full independence to do so.

Unfortunately, throughout the last year, the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress have repeatedly tried to roll back access to care and undermine the health of women. We have seen bill after bill targeting women's healthcare by restricting access to abortion, increasing the costs of maternity care, and allowing insurers to treat giving birth as a preexisting condition.

The Trump administration issued interim final rules, allowing employers to deny women access to the birth control coverage they need. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have confirmed Trump administration officials and judges to the bench who are vehemently opposed to a woman's right to make her own reproductive health decisions. Republicans have been relentless in their attempts to defund Planned Parenthood, which is an essential source of care for women in New Hampshire and provides key services like birth control and cancer screenings.

Here we are, once again, with Republican leadership bringing a bill to the floor that attempts to marginalize women and take away their rights to make their own decisions. This bill