

legislation. I feel the need to respond to a few things that he said because they call for an immediate response.

First, he noted that there were two votes cast earlier this week that he described as part of an ongoing pattern, an ongoing campaign among Senate Republicans that, according to my colleague, are anti-woman. This is offensive on a variety of levels—first when you consider that the abortion is no respecter of persons. It is not just male babies aborted; it is also female babies. There are parts of the world where abortion of female babies occurs in much higher numbers—in many cases because they are female babies.

Abortion is itself—elective abortion is an act of violence against a human form, against a human life, albeit a life in utero.

I remember a few months ago we were holding a hearing, of all things, addressing issues relating to wild horses and burros in the Western United States. Certain wild horse populations have grown out of control. They have devastated rangelands. They have depleted resources available to them, and many of them are starving, malnourished, and suffering.

There have been programs that have sought not only to help them in one way or another but also to sterilize them. I never thought I would be part of a significant hearing addressing the nonsexy topic of equine contraception, but in this instance we had one. One of our witnesses, who was from an organization devoted to preventing cruelty to animals, explained that one of the most effective techniques of horse birth control involves the sterilization procedure. I asked why that was not the preferred method. She said because, in many instances, it can result in the loss of the unborn horse. I asked her why that mattered. She said: Well, because it is a life, notwithstanding the fact that it hasn't been born. It is cruel to the unborn baby horse. It is cruel to the foal. If it is cruel to the foal, why isn't it cruel to the baby, whether it is a male baby or a female baby? This is not anti-woman.

There was also the suggestion that the campaign somehow involves a Republican in every exam room, and that, according to those who advocate pro-life positions, it would relegate healthcare to the healthy and wealthy. Well, this gets back to the very point I was making. An exam room—actual healthcare—involves protecting and preserving human life. Elective abortion, by contrast, has one object; that is, the termination of a human life—an unborn, in utero human life but a human life just the same.

You can say whatever you want about it but to call it healthcare, to me, is counterintuitive—not just to me but to many, many Americans who find the practice abhorrent and are shocked by the thought that the U.S. Government would be subsidizing it, whether through its tax policy or through more direct forms or, as we see today, both.

As to the suggestion that politicians ought to stay out of this issue, well, let me ask you this: What about the idea that politicians and, therefore, lawmakers ought to stay out of other issues involving violence to a human being? There was a day and age in this country where people would say that lawmakers ought to stay out of other issues involving violence, of domestic violence: That is a family matter, after all. Politicians ought to stay out. The law should have nothing to do with that. Well, it involves violence to another human being.

To say simply that politicians and, therefore, lawmakers and, therefore, the law ought to stay out of a topic means to suggest that it is somehow beyond the reach of the law. If we have reached, if we ever do reach the point where we can't say no human being can kill another human being, we have really, really big problems.

We are not talking here about an exam room. We are not talking about procedures designed to promote, to heal, and to prolong life. We are talking about a procedure to end life. This is, itself, not a bill that talks about the appropriateness or lack thereof of elective abortion. This simply says that, given how many Americans feel about this, as many of us in this very room feel about abortion, we shouldn't be subsidizing it, and we shouldn't be pretending it is something it is not.

Finally, let me remind this body and anyone who may be watching from outside this body that, of the legislation we voted on this week, one of those pieces of legislation didn't even involve abortion at all. It didn't regulate any facet of abortion. It dealt only indirectly with the topic of abortion, but it had nothing to do with the performance or availability of an abortion itself.

It simply said that, when a baby is born, following or in the middle of a failed attempt at an abortion, if that baby is born alive, notwithstanding the attempt by the abortionist to kill the baby, that baby shouldn't simply be neglected. In any other circumstance, a human being, particularly a vulnerable, brandnew newborn baby—an infant—to neglect the baby and allow that baby to die of exposure, to not administer lifesaving care or nutrition or sustenance to that baby, to neglect the baby and allow that baby to die of exposure would be a crime. In some circumstances, it may well be murder. In others, it would be a serious criminal form of deliberate child neglect.

So, to suggest that a baby is somehow different as a result of a subjective intent of the abortionist to kill the baby and that we shouldn't make sure that baby is properly cared for following its birth is barbaric. Look, I get it. Not everybody shares my viewpoint with regard to when human life begins. I get it. Not everybody shares my view with regard to abortion policy. Now, I will defend to my dying day my views on these issues, and I will not shrink

from them, but regardless of whether you agree with me on that, I seriously question how anyone would credibly maintain that a human being born alive following a failed abortion attempt shouldn't be given the same protection under the law as any other human being.

In other words, the humanness of a baby shouldn't depend on that baby's "wantedness." The fact that anyone wanted to kill that baby before the baby was born doesn't give anyone the right to kill the baby with impunity.

That is what they voted down this week. Let's not pretend that this is about exam rooms. Let's not pretend that this is about actual healthcare. Let's not pretend that this is somehow an anti-woman strategy.

By the way, many women I know—most, I would say—actually find quite offensive the suggestion that to be in favor of protecting babies is somehow anti-woman. This is offensive. It is sad to me, more than anything.

This was a lost opportunity that we had this week to protect the dignity of human life, not just unborn human life but human beings who have been born.

One day we will look back and see this week through sad eyes in much the same way we now look back on other episodes in American history where we have failed to accord the full dignity to a human life that each human life truly deserves.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HISTORIC SEATING OF HIRAM RHODES REVELS AS THE FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN UNITED STATES SENATOR

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, as Black History Month comes to a close in our land, I rise this afternoon to draw attention to the fact that the first African-American U.S. Senator in our Republic's history was Hiram Rhodes Revels of my State of Mississippi.

As a matter of fact, 150 years ago this week, history was made in this very room when Hiram Rhodes Revels took the oath of office and broke the color barrier in the U.S. Senate. There was celebration. There was a congratulation on both sides of the aisle, but it was not unanimous. As a matter of fact, eight Senators objected to the seating of Hiram Revels as a U.S. Senator, simply because he was a Black man. Thank goodness it was only eight and that position did not prevail, and Hiram Revels entered the history books of the United States of America as being our first African-American Senator.

In a moment, I will ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution commemorating this momentous occasion, some 150 years ago this week. I will not read the entire resolution that I have, but I point out that I

have a resolution cosponsored on a very bipartisan basis by 71 of my fellow Senators.

Pointing out a few things about the history of this extraordinary public servant, this giant of American history, Hiram Rhodes Revels was born a free African American in 1827 in Fayetteville, Cumberland County, NC. He was well-educated in a number of States, including North Carolina, Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois. Then he entered the ministry, where he served in Maryland and in Missouri and, eventually, of course, coming to the State of Mississippi.

By 1868, the Reverend Hiram Rhodes Revels was also Alderman Hiram Rhodes Revels in Natchez, MS, and he went on to a career of public service. Then, the legislature, which made those decisions in that time under our U.S. Constitution, chose Reverend Revels to come to Washington, DC, and serve as a Senator.

He served capably. He was well received and well admired, and he brought a degree of conciliation and togetherness to this Senate that we had not had before. He only served a little over a year. He chose, instead, to return to Mississippi to become a college president, continue in education, and continue in the ministry in Mississippi, having served as president of what is now Alcorn State University and also having served in Holly Springs, MS, in what is now Rust College. He was in the ministry in Aberdeen, MS, at the time of his death and is buried in Holly Springs, MS.

I very much appreciate the help of Democrats and Republicans in getting this resolution right. There have only been 10 African Americans in the history of our Republic to serve in the U.S. Senate. One of them—the first one—was Hiram Rhodes Revels. Three of them are serving today in the U.S. Senate.

I will acknowledge the help that I received from a number of my colleagues in adding information to this resolution to make it better and fuller and more complete. I appreciate the bipartisan cosponsorship of this but also the bipartisan suggestions that I received and incorporated into the resolution to make it better.

I am honored to represent the same State that this pioneer represented and began to represent some 150 years ago this week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 508, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 508) commemorating the 150th anniversary of the historic seating of Hiram Rhodes Revels as the first African American United States Senator.

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions 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 resolution (S. Res. 508) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Ohio.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, over and over, we see the President and Republicans in Congress trying to take healthcare away from people, particularly women. We see it with the President's lawsuits, trying to take away the consumer protections for pre-existing conditions. We see the vote in the Senate—defeated by one vote, but a vote in the Senate—which would have scaled back the bipartisan Medicaid expansion in Ohio that my Republican Governor—I am a Democrat—and we did bipartisanly in Ohio. We have seen attempts by Republicans to take away healthcare then, and now we—especially just this week—see that with women's healthcare. That is what the bills we voted down this week were all about. They are about politicians putting themselves in the middle of the sacred doctor-patient relationship. It intimidates women, and it intimidates medical professionals. Doctors aren't sure what might happen to them in some cases. It takes away the freedom of women to make their own decisions.

We defeated them earlier this week, but they are not letting up. They tried again to pass yet another bill that has only one purpose: stigmatizing women's healthcare.

Supporters of these bills, including the President of the United States, have spread lies and misinformation. It is despicable. That is why doctors and medical experts alike oppose these bills.

Think about these groups: the American College of Nurse-Midwives, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Medical Women's Association, the American Public Health Association—on whom we rely so much now on the coronavirus—the American Society for Reproductive Medicine, and the Association of Physician Assistants in Obstetrics and Gynecology. All of these organizations oppose this bill because they see it for what it is: a compromise of women's health. It is politicians, it is elected officials in this body, it is Leader MCCONNELL from his office down the hall always playing to his interest groups, always playing politics. It is Senator MCCONNELL and his allies getting between the patient—the woman—and her doctor, as if mostly male politicians should be making these decisions

about women's lives and about the relationship between a woman and her doctor.

All of these groups that I mentioned, again, the American College of Nurse-Midwives, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Medical Women's Association, American Public Health Association—all of these groups have written in to oppose politicians interfering in the patient-provider relationship and the criminalizing of patient care. Do we want a bunch of male politicians, do we want people like President Trump and Vice President PENCE from the Presiding Officer's home State, and do we want a bunch of politicians like MITCH MCCONNELL—do we want them to be able to criminalize a doctor, get in the middle of a patient-doctor relationship and criminalize that? There is no question that is what this is about.

They act as though they know better than you—a woman—and your doctor. It is nothing new. We have seen it over and over. We have seen Washington politicians, we see Columbus politicians in my State, most of them men, obsessed with trying to assert themselves into women's healthcare decisions. They can't help themselves. They just keep doing it. Those decisions should be and are between a woman and her doctor, period.

It is time, if I can say this, that old men in Washington and in courtrooms and in State legislatures stop trying to take away women's healthcare, particularly when we have so much work to do in healthcare.

We could be working instead of a bunch of votes—I mean, I understand; we know Senator MCCONNELL is in his office down the hall, and we know what he does. We know he brings forward legislation to get his base excited, to make sure the most conservative voters in the country come out to vote. We know he does legislation all the time to help his big financial contributors—to help the drug companies, to help the insurance companies, to help the gun lobby. We know that is what MITCH MCCONNELL does.

Instead of trying to compromise women's health, take healthcare away, instead of eliminating consumer protections for preexisting conditions, he could actually do something about drug prices. We could be working to protect the millions of Americans with preexisting conditions.

In this country, 10 years ago, we passed a bill which said that if you are sick—you are really sick—and you spend a lot of money on healthcare, your health insurance company in the past would just cut your insurance off and you were out of luck. You would then choose between going to the doctor or not and all that can happen or you go bankrupt. We changed that. The Affordable Care Act said: No, you can't. Just because you are sick and you are expensive, an insurance company can't take your insurance away. They can't cancel it.

President Trump has tried for 3 years now to change that and take away those consumer protections. He has gotten support from MITCH MCCONNELL and from virtually almost every—except for John McCain and a couple of other Senators from their side—almost every Republican in this Senate to say that it is OK to take away consumer protections for preexisting conditions.

Instead of doing that, we could work to keep drug prices down. We could give tax credits to help people afford insurance. We could protect the ability to stay on your parents' healthcare. If you are 25 years old, you could be on your parents' health insurance. They are trying to take that away. They are trying to take Medicaid expansion away.

They are trying to make limits on how much you pay out of pocket each year. Those are the kinds of things we should be agreeing on.

Free preventive screening services— if you are a senior, if you are on Medicare, you can get free screening for osteoporosis, free screening for diabetes. The President and this Congress tried to take those services away.

Five million Ohioans under 65 have preexisting conditions. Basically, if you are over 50 in this country, the chances are overwhelming that you have a preexisting condition. Do you want to lose those consumer protections? Of course not.

Instead of making it harder for Ohio women to get the care they need, instead of tearing down the Affordable Care Act, let's make it stronger. Let's get drug prices under control. Let's tell American women we trust them; we trust them to make their own decisions.

I yield the floor.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 573 through 582, 584 through 585, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Joseph R. Harris, II
Col. Gent Welsh, Jr.

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Billy M. Nabors

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. AnnMarie K. Anthony
Col. Taft O. Aujero
Col. Douglas B. Baker
Col. Robert D. Bowie
Col. Barbra S. Buls
Col. Donald K. Carpenter
Col. Konata A. Crumbly
Col. Johan A. Deutscher
Col. Patrick W. Donaldson
Col. Bradford R. Everman
Col. Virginia I. Gaglio
Col. Caesar R. Garduno
Col. Patrick M. Hanlon
Col. Robert E. Hargens
Col. Jeffrey L. Hedges
Col. Samuel C. Keener
Col. Robert I. Kinney
Col. Jerry P. Reedy
Col. Bryan E. Salmon
Col. Tamala A. Saylor
Col. James S. Shigekane
Col. Kimbra L. Sterr
Col. Michael A. Valle
Col. Brian E. Vaughn

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Dann S. Carlson
Col. Shawn M. Coco
Col. Steven E. Coney
Col. Patrick E. DeConcini
Col. Paul E. Franz
Col. John F. Hall
Col. Kenneth M. Haltom
Col. Chris J. Ioder
Col. Robert A. King
Col. Michael J. Lovell
Col. Sue Ellen Schuerman
Col. Christopher J. Sheppard
Col. Charles A. Shurlow
Col. Lisa K. Snyder

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Steven J. deMilliano
Brig. Gen. David J. Meyer
Brig. Gen. Russell L. Ponder

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Andrew J. MacDonald

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Todd M. Audet
Brig. Gen. Kimberly A. Baumann
Brig. Gen. Floyd W. Dunstan
Brig. Gen. Randal K. Efferson
Brig. Gen. Laurie M. Farris
Brig. Gen. James R. Kriesel
Brig. Gen. William P. Robertson
Brig. Gen. James R. Stevenson, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Charles M. Walker
Brig. Gen. David A. Weishaar
Brig. Gen. Gregory T. White

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Christopher E. Finerty

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph B. Wilson

IN THE ARMY

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Ronald F. Taylor

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Michael S. Martin

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Douglas K. Clark
Col. John F. Kelliher, III

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1443 AIR FORCE nominations (5) beginning JOSHUA E. ERLANDSEN, and ending TOSHA M. VANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1444 AIR FORCE nominations (44) beginning MATTHEW G. ADKINS, and ending CATHERINE M. WARE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1445 AIR FORCE nominations (31) beginning JENARA L. ALLEN, and ending SARAH M. WHEELER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1446 AIR FORCE nominations (129) beginning DANIEL J. ADAMS, and ending ZACHARY E. WRIGHT, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2020.

PN1447 AIR FORCE nominations (18) beginning JENNIFER R. BEIN, and ending ANGELA K. STANTON, which nominations