The question about abortion has been historically a question about, when does life begin? I am one of those crazy radicals who actually believe in science. I think, when cell division is occurring and when DNA is there that is different from the mom's and different from the dad's, that it is actually a different human being—a smaller human being but a different human being. That is what everyone in science believes. That child who is developing is alive. The day of his birth is just another day. Now, it is a pretty traumatic day for him to transition from being inside the womb to the outside, but birth is just another day of life for that child because he is fully developed. He was developing in the womb, and he is developing outside the womb. Every single person who can hear this has had the exact same experience of developing in the womb.

This seemed like a commonsense issue until the legislators in the State of New York, a few weeks ago, stood and cheered and applauded when they passed a bill for third-trimester abortions. These are ultra-late-term abortions. This is a fully viable child abortion.

Let me review quickly what the State of New York did. There are only four countries in the world that allow late-term abortions. There are only four left—North Korea, China, Vietnam, and the United States. Those in the New York Legislature stood and cheered that they are in the middle of the human rights-depraved nations of China, North Korea, and Vietnam. That is at 24 weeks and on. At 20 weeks, there is still Canada and the Netherlands and Singapore that are left, but by 24 weeks, at that late-term, Canada, the Netherlands, and Singapore drop off. They say: No, we are out. That is a fully viable child. Yet those in the New York Legislature stood and applauded.

It got one-upped in Virginia last week as the Governor of Virginia explained Virginia's late-term abortion bill as one-upping New York's. He said, in Virginia's bill, in his words, this is how it would work. If children have deformities, however that is defined, or for the mental or physical health, however they want to define that because there was no definition, they would deliver the child, make him comfortable, resuscitate the child if the mother wants, and then would discuss what to do with the child.

It is not enough for the State of New York to applaud late-term abortions and join North Korea, China, and Vietnam as the only places on Earth to allow this. No. The Virginia Democrats had to go one more and say: Let's deliver the children and then discuss it based on their deformities.

Back to the Super Bowl conversation, one of the most popular commercials in the Super Bowl was for a gaming system that showed kids with disabilities who played a video game just like other kids, except now they want to decide at those children's births whether to just take their lives then. How in the world can we as a culture run a television commercial and say: That kid is just like that kid. Look, they play games just alike. But when they are little, let's deliver them and discuss it and figure out what we want to do.

This is infanticide. This is not about pro-life and pro-choice; this is pro-humanity. To get to the point at which we are discussing whether children live or die based on what they look like at birth and then, if they don't quite look right, we will take those lives is inhumane and is beneath us as a society. I cannot fathom the discussion that we are having on the floor of the U.S. Senate as to whether a fully delivered child lives or dies or discuss what happens during a botched abortion when a child is fully delivered. It used to be that my Democratic colleagues said life begins at birth. Now, apparently, it is not at birth anymore; it is unknown when life actually begins because it is a discussion we are going to have at their births now.

How can we block this bill? How can this, of all things, not bring unanimous consent? It is inhumane.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I came here mostly to support my colleagues and to actually listen for an objection to a bill like this. For the short time I have been here, what a rude awakening as to what can happen.

Everything I have heard here makes sense, and I would just ask for the citizens across this country and for Hoosiers to weigh in. Let your Senators know that this is a step too far when something like this occurs in this Chamber, when it is crystallized so simply. You are either for or against infanticide, and I never imagined I would be seeing this so early in my tenure here. I ask for the folks across this country to make their voices heard because this is a tragedy that has happened.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, this is gross, what has happened here tonight. We should pass this by unanimous consent. If we continue being unable to pass it by unanimous consent, a lot of us are going to continue to fight for a rollcall vote because it is the right thing to do. Those little babies aren't Republicans or Democrats; they are babies. They need protection from all of us.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 9, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SASSE. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all time postcloture on S. 1 be considered expired at 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 5.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2019

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, February 5; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration S. 1 and that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on S. 1.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:37 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 5, 2019, at 10 a.m.