

percent of those were in Western Washington. According to researchers at the University of Washington, just 20 years from now, we will see the median annual burned area in the Northwest double from what we have seen in the last 50 years.

We know we need more tools to combat these challenges, and the legislation we have already passed in the Senate and that is before the House today will provide these new technology and training tools to empower the Forest Service to help our communities and our firefighters: real-time fire mapping, more drone technology to give us real-time information about the fires, using NASA data to help us plan post-fires, and giving us more smoke forecasting information to better help our communities and to deal with those who are impacted by heavy smoke.

I hope our colleagues will act expeditiously on this legislation. We know that wildland fire funding, as we increased it in an agreement last year, was so important, but we need to keep working on this problem.

I thank my colleague from Colorado for helping to sponsor the inclusion of this legislation and hope that the President will sign this legislation very quickly so that tools can be put in place for this upcoming fire season.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

RECESS

Mr. CRUZ. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:45 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

S. 311

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday evening the Senate had an opportunity to go on record and show our constituents that we supported the most vulnerable among us. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act would require doctors to treat a baby, once it is born, with ordinary medical assistance, something they would do under any other circumstances, even though this entailed surviving an abortion.

If you ask the American people, they would say this is just common sense. In a recent poll, more than three-fourths

of Americans said they support providing medical treatment for babies who survive abortions. I can't imagine what the other 25 percent are thinking. But there are no Federal laws requiring healthcare providers to care for these babies just as they would any other infant in their care, and for some Members of the opposing party, they are just fine with that.

We all know that a few weeks ago, Virginia Governor Ralph Northam made disturbing comments about how to not care for certain newborns. He was asked: What would you do with a child with birth defects?

He said: Well, the infant would be delivered. The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated, if that is what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother.

Let me be clear. The Governor, who is a pediatrician, by the way, essentially advocated for infanticide—killing a child who was born alive. Instead of saying, “well, it is my duty as a physician under the Hippocratic Oath to provide care to save the child,” he believes the child ought to be made comfortable, and then the mother and doctor sit down and decide whether the child should live or die.

That is not healthcare. That is murder. I believe the Senate has a duty to act and ensure that no child born alive is subjected to the treatment described by Governor Northam.

The bill we voted on last night would protect newborns who have survived abortions and ensure that they receive the same level of care that any other newborn baby would. It builds upon a previous law, which the Senate passed unanimously, called the Born-Alive Infant Protection Act. That bill passed unanimously in 2002, and it clarified that every infant born alive at any stage of development is a person, regardless of the manner in which they were born. Yet yesterday, 44 Senators voted to allow that same person's life to be ended with impunity.

The legislation we voted on yesterday would simply clarify that the infants who survive abortions are entitled to the same lifesaving care that other babies should receive. That is why it is so shocking to me that 44 of our colleagues chose to vote against even proceeding to a debate and a vote on the matter.

I am trying to think of a historical counterpart to this. I was reminded of a book I read not long ago called “Eichmann in Jerusalem.” This is about the trial of Adolf Eichmann after the atrocities of the holocaust, during which 5 million Jews were killed. The author, Hannah Arendt, was trying to figure out what kind of monster could basically provide for the machinery that ultimately would take the lives of 5 million Jews.

What she saw when she looked at Eichmann was not some monster that looked different from you or me. Unfor-

tunately, what she saw was somebody who looked exactly like you and me. She wrote about the moral collapse associated with the holocaust. She noted that “in the Third Reich, evil lost its distinctive characteristic by which most people had, until then, recognized it.” She said that the problem is that at that point it became a “civil norm.” She wrote:

Evil comes from a failure to think. It defies thought, for as soon as thought tries to engage itself with evil and examine the premises and principles from which it originates, it is frustrated because it finds nothing there.

“That,” she said, “is the banality of evil.”

She concluded by saying:

Nearly everybody who attended the trials of mass killers after the war, some of them respected doctors and pharmacists, came away with the disconcerting impression that the killers looked pretty much like you and me.

So while Republicans and Democrats disagree on a range of issues, this should not be one of them. If we have one shred of our humanity left, we ought to agree that protecting human life is essential. This should have been a simple vote for every single Member of this body. I can't tell you how disappointed I am that 44 of our colleagues decided to vote no. I was proud to vote yes on the bill, yes to protecting these newborn babies, yes to equal medical care for all infants, and yes to life.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

Madam President, this morning, the Senate Finance Committee held the second in a series of hearings on prescription drug pricing. We all know that across the country, the rising costs of prescription drugs is placing a strain on families.

A survey last summer found that many Texans are struggling to afford the rising cost of healthcare, and three out of five people surveyed reported foregoing or postponing care because of the cost. That includes cutting pills in half, skipping or rationing doses, or not filling a prescription because they simply can't afford to do so. Some, though, are taking even more drastic steps.

Last year, a widow in Austin considered selling her house to pay for the expensive drugs she needed to treat hepatitis C, which had killed her husband years earlier. Many Texas families have begun the dangerous practice of buying their drugs in Mexico—even though they may be counterfeit—because they think they are more affordable than filling a prescription in the United States.

With healthcare costs continuing to press more and more of our hard-working families, things aren't expected to get any easier any time soon. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services estimated that between 2018 and 2027, consumers could expect to see prescription drug spending increase by an average of 6.1 percent a year. That is a