

a good job, I will be the first to praise him. If he backs off or takes some temporary measure in decreasing the balance of trade but doesn't change China's structural rapaciousness against the United States and our intellectual property and our industrial know-how, he will be criticized by me and many others on both sides of the aisle.

S. 311

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, a word on today's vote on women's reproductive rights: The bill the Senate will vote on shortly is carefully crafted to target, intimidate, and shut down reproductive healthcare providers. Doctors across this country—Democratic doctors, Republican doctors—are lining up against the bill because it would impose requirements on what type of care doctors must provide in certain circumstances, even if that care is ineffective, contradictory to medical evidence, and against the family's wishes.

My Republican colleagues have said some incendiary things about opposing this bill. Let me be very clear. Many of these claims are false. It has always been illegal to harm a newborn infant. This vote has nothing—nothing—to do with that. Read the language. We are talking about situations when expectant parents tragically learn their pregnancy is no longer viable, and there is a fatal diagnosis. What happens in those circumstances should be decided between a woman, her family, her minister, priest, rabbi, imam, and her doctor.

It makes no sense for Washington politicians who know nothing about individual circumstances to say they know better than the doctors or the patients and their families. The bill is solely meant to intimidate doctors and restrict patients' access to care and has nothing—nothing, nothing—to do with protecting children.

Last Friday, the administration announced it was imposing a gag rule on U.S. reproductive healthcare providers and trying to restrict access to healthcare clinics that provide reproductive care. So this vote doesn't occur in a vacuum. It is part of a pattern of actions taken by President Trump and congressional Republicans to limit, deny, or circumscribe a woman's right to healthcare.

I urge the American people to do their own research, read the bill, and see what it says. Most of you will agree with it. Pay attention to the facts and not the false rhetoric. This bill is Washington politics at its worst. I will vote no.

VICTIMS OF 9/11 COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally—and this time it is finally, I say to my good friend from Nebraska—I turn the attention of my colleagues to a harrowing fact: We are vastly approaching the point where more people

will have died from exposure to toxic chemicals on 9/11 than were killed on 9/11 itself. These are the first responders, firefighters, police, and FBI agents who rushed to the towers that fateful day, ran into the fire, smoke, and twisted steel, risking their lives and, later, we learned, risking their health to get people out. These are the union members and construction workers who worked at the pile, breathing in a toxic blend of ash and dust in the days and weeks and months that followed. These are the people, the innocents, who lived downtown when the United States was attacked in the most dastardly attack on American soil.

Right now we have a problem. While these folks are heroes and, sadly, many are suffering—because of the alarming number who are suffering from 9/11-related illnesses, the victim compensation fund is running out of money earlier than expected. The Justice Department recently announced that it might have to cut compensation awards between 50 and 70 percent.

So today I was proud to join Senators GILLIBRAND and GARDNER, as well as a group of our colleagues in the House, to introduce legislation to fix the shortfall of funding and put the victims' compensation fund on sure footing for the foreseeable future.

I urge all of my colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, to sign on and help us pass this bill and give some hope to the thousands who were brave on 9/11 and who are suffering now.

I yield the floor.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 311, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 311, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5:30 p.m. today, including quorum calls, be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, I just listened to the senior Senator from New York—my friend from the gym and the minority leader—deliver some summaries of what he said was in the bill before us, and he implored this body and implored the people watching on C-SPAN to read the bill, stating they would find that all of these terrible things are in the bill.

I see the minority leader has to leave the floor now, but, humbly, I would

urge him to come back and show us where any of what he just said is in this bill. What he said wasn't true.

I rise today for a simple purpose. I want to ask each and every one of our colleagues whether we are OK with infanticide. This language is blunt. I recognize that, and it is too blunt for many people in this body, but, frankly, that is what we are talking about here today.

Infanticide is what the abortion survivors—Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is actually about.

Are we a country that protects babies who are alive, born outside the womb after having survived a botched abortion? That is what this is about.

Are we a country that says it is OK to actively allow that baby to die, which is the current position of Federal law? That is the question before us, plain and simple.

Here are the facts. We know that some babies, especially late in gestation, survive attempted abortions. We know, too, that some of these babies are left to die—left to die. No further protections exist today to shield them from this ugly fate, and only some States have protections on their books. We have seen in our national discourse over the last month and a half a few States moving in different ways to undo protections that some of these babies have had at the State level.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is trying to right this obvious wrong. The bill's terms are simple: A child born alive during a botched abortion would be given the same level of care that would be provided to any other baby born at that same gestational age. That is it.

This bill isn't about abortion. I am pro-life—unapologetically pro-life—but this bill is not about anything that limits abortion. This bill doesn't have anything to do with *Roe v. Wade*. This bill is about something else. What this bill does is try to secure basic rights, equal rights for babies who are born and are outside the womb. That is what we are talking about.

Over the course of the next hour, as this is debated on the floor, people are going to say a whole bunch of other things. I would ask them to please bring the text of the bill to the floor when they do it and show us whether there is anything about limiting abortion in this bill.

This bill is exclusively about protecting babies who have already been born and are outside of the womb. Every baby deserves a fighting chance, whether that 24-week old baby, fighting for air and fighting for life, having just taken her first breaths, is at an abortion clinic where she survived a botched abortion or she is in a delivery room at the local hospital. Both of those babies are equally deserving of care, protection, and humane treatment, and our laws should treat both of these human beings as babies because they are babies. They have been born, and they are outside of the womb.