

complications include, for example, if the mother has what is called an ectopic pregnancy, where the unborn child and the placenta are not in the womb but are outside of the womb. If that occurs and these pills are taken—the pill known as Mifeprex, RU486—it can cause that pregnancy to rupture, and instead of the bleeding coming out as the child would, through the vagina, it means that internal bleeding occurs, which can result in the mother's death.

Chemical abortions have four times the complications that surgical abortions do in the first trimester, and as many as 6 percent of women taking these abortion drugs require surgery to complete the abortion—potentially painful and life-threatening and, of course, horrific for the unborn child.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has stated that “compared with surgical abortion, medical abortion takes longer to complete, requires more active patient participation, and is associated with higher reported rates of bleeding and cramping.”

The bill we are discussing today, the SAVE Moms and Babies Act, or the Support and Value Expectant Moms and Babies Act, takes substantive steps to protect the health of women and the unborn child. The bill prevents approval of new abortion drugs by the FDA, keeps the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy, or REMS, protocol, and curtails abortion pills from being dispensed by mail or through telemedicine.

I introduced the Teleabortion Prevention Act of 2020 in February, which requires a doctor to physically examine a pregnant mom before prescribing any abortion-related drugs and requires a followup appointment. We actually want women to receive healthcare, by healthcare providers who care about their health.

If Senators in this body really care about women's health, they should join with us to stop these do-it-yourself abortions. Preventing abortion protects unborn babies, but preventing chemical abortions protects women.

Let's work together to protect women by passing the SAVE Moms and Babies Act to forever end dangerous chemical abortions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 3072 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. The FDA

approved mifepristone nearly 20 years ago, and leading medical organizations have made clear that restrictions on it like those that are in this bill are not based on evidence or patients' best interests. This bill is not about science or healthcare or what is best for women across the Nation. It is about ideology and Republicans wanting to do every single thing they can to chip away at the right to a safe, legal abortion.

Not on my watch. This is far from the only Republican effort to ignore the science and the medical professionals and overrule the personal decisions of patients across the country.

At this very moment, they are gearing up to jam through President Trump's Supreme Court nominee and strike down *Roe v. Wade*. But as sure as I am standing here today to oppose this effort to restrict women's reproductive rights, you can bet I will be standing with women and men across the country to oppose that one too.

I will offer legislation in a moment that actually does work to protect and help women and families in a moment, but for now, on this request, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4638

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are in the middle of a pandemic. Two hundred thousand people have died, millions more have been infected, and this crisis is nowhere close to being over. But are Republicans are offering solutions? Not even close.

We need to be prioritizing science. Instead, they are offering a bill that prioritizes partisan ideology. We need to be making it easier for people to get the care they need. Instead, they are offering a bill with the sole purpose of putting up unnecessary barriers to care. And not only are they wasting time on their partisan war against abortion with this bill—which they know is a nonstarter—they are preparing to jam through a Supreme Court nominee who would make things even worse.

They are fighting to not just overturn *Roe v. Wade* but to strike down healthcare for tens of millions of people and strike down protections for people with preexisting conditions and to send healthcare costs skyrocketing—all during a pandemic.

I can't believe I have to say this, but we need to be taking steps to make this crisis better, not worse, which is why I am going to offer a unanimous consent request that the Senate proceed to S. 4638—the Science and Transparency Over Politics Act, which Senator SCHUMER and myself and 32 other Democrats introduced today.

Unfortunately, we have seen the Trump administration repeatedly take dangerous steps to undermine and overrule the experts at our Nation's public agencies. We have seen the President spread lies and misinformation and conspiracy theories about

their work. We have seen his officials meddle with key scientific reports and apply pressure to promote unproven treatments. And we know this interference can damage public confidence in the science-based guidance our experts issue to help save lives and in their efforts to evaluate a vaccine and make sure it is safe and effective. We just can't let that happen.

This reckless interference didn't start yesterday, and it is clear it is not going to stop tomorrow. So I believe Congress needs to take action to make it stop.

The STOP Act would do just that by providing much needed transparency and accountability. Given how many Republicans have said we need to be listening to the experts and following the science, this bill should not be controversial. It should be common sense.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 4638, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am disappointed but can't say I am surprised that the Senators on the other side of the aisle have objected to the SAVE Moms and Babies Act. The Democrats have shown time and again that they would rather put the profits of the abortion industry over protecting women. That is what is happening again today.

Make no mistake, the Democrats are trying to change to another bill because they want to distract you from what my bill is about. My bill is about protecting women from dangerous at-home abortions without a physician involved whatsoever. That is what my bill does—ensure women have to see a doctor to get this drug, ensure the doctor can examine her to see if she has any conditions that might make her at higher risk for complications, make sure she is fully informed and consents that she is not coerced.

Democrats objecting to this shows you how far to the left the Democratic Party is on abortion. Passing my bill should be a no-brainer. The REMS rules were put into place by a Democratic FDA to protect women. They have been in effect for 20 years, until the judge in Maryland fell for some far-fetched arguments from abortion advocates.

The FDA and HHS implement government health and safety regulations to protect patients and ensure that doctors are doing their job, to make

sure that drugs are safe and that patients are not harmed. That is why we have an FDA and why we have an HHS.

I agree with the Senator from Washington State that FDA and HHS should do this work based on scientific evidence. That is exactly what happened in 2000 when the Clinton administration and FDA scientists looked at the evidence and decided these REMS rules were needed to protect women from the dangers of this abortion drug.

Usually, Democrats support science-based health protections but not when it comes to abortion. When it comes to abortion, they are in the pocket of the abortion lobby and would rather play politics rather than protect women's health.

We can't let Senate Democrats change the subject by trying to bring up another bill that is not related to these REMS protections whatsoever. We can't let them try to change the subject from women's health to their latest conspiracy theory about the President. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

I do ask, invoking rule XIX, that no Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is disappointing that Republicans would object to a bill that simply provides much needed accountability and support for scientific decisionmaking. It is especially disappointing they would object to it during a pandemic and while simultaneously pushing for an ideological bill that would undermine patient's care and reproductive rights.

Rest assured, the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, and I and the rest of our Democratic caucus are not giving up, and we will continue to fight on behalf of women and families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, point of parliamentary inquiry: What was the statement that prompted the admonition under rule XIX?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Democrats are in the pockets of the abortion industry.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the thoughtful discussion that we have had today between my colleague from Mississippi and my colleague from the State of Washington. I also appreciate the thoughtful insight that the Senator from Louisiana provided in his remarks.

I feel it necessary to address a couple of issues that were raised by my friend and distinguished colleague from the State of Washington. There are differences that Members have—differences of opinion—when it comes to a wide variety of issues.

When it comes to abortion, people have different approaches they take. I

know my own view, and I know the views taken by many of my Democratic colleagues. But it is important to point out here what we are talking about and what we are not talking about.

One of the first arguments that we heard today from the Senator from Washington related to *Roe v. Wade*. And as long as we are on the topic of imputing to another person improper motives or motives not apparent on the face of a piece of legislation, if one is going to impute to the Senator from Mississippi the intention of undoing a Supreme Court precedent, I would like to point out that is manifestly not within the scope of this legislation, nor is it the place of any Senator to purport to know the subjective motivation behind Senator HYDE-SMITH's legislation here.

I am not going to purport to know the reason why she said that. I just want to point out, that is not the point of this bill. This bill has nothing to do with *Roe v. Wade*. You can feel however you want about *Roe v. Wade*. This isn't it. I know that is a convenient excuse to not have to deal with something—something real, something that has to do with the lives and the health and the well-being of women, to say nothing about the unborn human lives within them.

From those who would invoke science in opposing this bill, I would ask, on what planet does science back the idea we should remove the REMS restrictions from this supposed so-called form of healthcare—a form of healthcare that, as I mentioned a few moments ago, has resulted in thousands upon thousands of complications in the two decades it has been on the market? On what planet can one contend that one can't support this legislation without being opposed to science?

Back to the *Roe v. Wade* question. If every single time someone gets up to try to present legislation—legislation that as far as I can tell, the Senator from Washington wasn't claiming was outside of our legislative purview as Federal lawmakers—if every single time someone gets up to try to raise legitimate questions of public policy regarding the health, safety, and welfare of the American people, of the American patient, of American women subjected to very serious side effects from a piece of legislation—if no one can present legislation without being accused of trying to undo a 1973 court decision, which is, on its face, not even at issue in this legislation, then we are going to have a hard time carefully considering these things.

Last I checked, it is our job to decide questions of public policy—questions that are squarely within our Federal jurisdiction. One could argue, I suppose, about whether it was a good idea to put exclusive jurisdiction over the regulation of pharmaceuticals in this country under the FDA. One could make that argument.

I don't understand the Senator from Washington to be making a federalism argument. If she wants to have that conversation, I would love to have that with her. That would be fantastic. In fact, I would love to raise federalism concerns anytime we are discussing anything because it is far too seldom invoked here.

But that is not what this is about. What that argument was about was instead that the Senator from Mississippi supposedly is trying to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. And it couldn't possibly be the fact that she is there genuinely concerned about the thousands upon thousands of injuries that have been sustained as a result of this barbaric form of so-called medical treatment. It can't possibly be that.

If that is the case, if those who were so determined to make everything about *Roe v. Wade*—if they are right and if they were to have their way, then I guess we can't discuss anything even related to women's health that affects pregnancy.

Surely, that is not the argument. That can't be the argument. I don't think anyone, regardless of how they feel about *Roe v. Wade*, regardless of how they feel about government's role in abortion or not, if what we are talking about is the fact that we ought not loosen certain restrictions so as to allow people to gain access to an abortion cocktail that is dangerous under many circumstances, especially when it is administered without any kind of direct medical supervision or attention, if that is where we are, that is not good. That is messed up. Something is terribly wrong if we can't have a conversation about women's health without being accused of wanting to undo an entire line of precedent dating back to 1973.

Look, guilty as charged. I have my own views about that line of precedent. Those views are no secret. Those views are well-founded as a matter of science. They are well-founded as a matter of hundreds of years of American constitutional law, of common law, but I understand they are not the only views.

You cannot simply walk in here and say that because this addresses a type of abortion procedure, because *Roe v. Wade* reached the conclusion that it did, anyone who proposes a piece of legislation like the one proposed by Senator HYDE-SMITH today necessarily has as its object—that her subjective motivation behind filing that legislation is the undoing of *Roe v. Wade*, and because that is her supposed subjective motivation, we can't even have the conversation about what this does for women's health—to say: Let's draw the line, and let's not remove the REMS restrictions. Let's not let people order these through the mail and be administered these dangerous drugs without direct medical supervision.

The next line of reasoning used by the Senator, my friend and distinguished colleague from the State of

Washington, is that we are in the middle of a global pandemic. Yes, we are, but last I checked, that doesn't prevent or preclude us from discussing and addressing other things, from the funding of the government to Presidential nominees whom we confirm or don't confirm. That doesn't preclude us or excuse us from considering other pieces of legislation. I am struggling to understand how the existence of a global pandemic means that we can't even address another type of epidemic—one brought about potentially as a result of the abusive prescription and reckless misuse of abortion-inducing drug cocktails. This is beyond my ability to understand.

It is also beyond my ability to understand how a simple requirement that before one of these drugs is administered, the patient should have at her disposal a medical examination and some kind of medical attention. Nothing about *Roe v. Wade* says that you can't have laws restricting the manner in which abortions are performed. Nothing about *Roe v. Wade* says that a State or Congress itself may not require that abortions be performed by healthcare professionals under the supervision of a board certified medical doctor. Nothing about *Roe v. Wade* carries any implication for this. This legislation simply says: Let's make sure that medications like this are not used to harm American women.

I have other colleagues wishing to discuss this topic and other topics. Let me say this: Human life matters. Every human life means something. You can't snuff it out and pretend it doesn't exist, because it does. Every life matters to God. It matters in the universe. Whether you believe in God or not, life matters. You can't pretend it doesn't exist. Every life is unrepeatable, irreplaceable. We should vow to protect it.

For those who aren't interested in protecting unborn human life, let's at least focus on protecting the human lives that we all agree exist. That is what this legislation is about. Shame on us if we can't even do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague Senator LEE for an impassioned and effective argument.

I rise here today in support of my colleague Senator HYDE-SMITH's *SAVE Moms and Babies Act*, of which I am a proud cosponsor. I am disappointed that my colleagues would object to this bill to help safeguard and help expectant mothers.

The *SAVE Moms and Babies Act* would improve women's health by protecting important safety mechanisms put into place by the FDA. The Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy is an essential mechanism which ensures that drugs with serious safety concerns are used and prescribed correctly.

My Democratic colleagues and the abortion lobby may expect Americans to believe chemical abortion pills are

safe to use and should be available online without an in-person physician consultation, but here are the facts: Between 3.4 and 5.9 percent of women taking chemical abortion drugs require surgical intervention to complete the abortion. This meant 10,000 women in 2017 alone needed surgery after taking an abortion drug. Chemical abortion has four times the complications as surgical abortion during the first trimester. The risk of complications are particularly worsened in the case of an ectopic pregnancy. Women with ectopic pregnancies have suffered serious injury and even death from taking chemical abortion drugs.

I am disappointed this Chamber could not come together today to support Senator HYDE-SMITH's timely, needed, and important bill to protect women's health.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. 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. COTTON. 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. COTTON. I know of no further debate on this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no further debate on the nomination, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Soderling nomination?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) would have voted yea.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 189 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Blunt	Burr
Barrasso	Boozman	Cassidy
Blackburn	Braun	Collins

Cornyn	Inhofe	Roberts
Cotton	Jones	Romney
Cramer	Kennedy	Rounds
Crapo	Lankford	Rubio
Cruz	Lee	Sasse
Daines	Loeffler	Scott (FL)
Enzi	Manchin	Scott (SC)
Ernst	McConnell	Shelby
Fischer	McSally	Sinema
Gardner	Moran	Thune
Graham	Murkowski	Toomey
Grassley	Paul	Wicker
Hawley	Perdue	Young
Hoeben	Portman	
Hyde-Smith	Risch	

NAYS—41

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

NOT VOTING—7

Capito	Sanders	Tillis
Harris	Stabenow	
Johnson	Sullivan	

The nomination was confirmed.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, on rollcall vote 189, I voted nay. It was my intention to vote yea. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, for debate only, for 30 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMANDER JOHN SCOTT HANNON VETERANS MENTAL HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I am pleased to share with my colleagues in the Senate that we have reached an agreement with the House to pass S. 785, the Commander John Scott Hannon Veterans Mental Health Improvement Act, and we expect the bill to pass the House of Representatives tomorrow.

This is a bill that passed—our most significant piece of legislation—from the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs dealing with mental health and suicide prevention. The bill came out