

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. LIVAN). 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—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 Pickering 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.