The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the center of our joy, make us Your captives so that we may live liberated lives. Provide our Senators with the spiritual, mental, social, and physical revitalization they need just for today.

May they place their trust in You and experience Your profound peace. Lord, grant that they will relinquish their worries to You as they permit Your perfect love to cast out every fear. Show them Your redemptive purposes in every problem they must solve.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

READING OF WASHINGTON’S FAREWELL ADDRESS
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WICKER). Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, as modified by the order of February 4, 2020, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN, will now read Washington’s Farewell Address.

Ms. BALDWIN, at the rostrum, read the Farewell Address as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you at the same time to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country—and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar
value to my services, they were temporary. I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many favors which has conferred upon me, still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness not equal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise and as an instructive example in our annals that, under circumstances in which the propensities of agility, as well as those of doubtful and uncertain materials of manufacturing industry, and commercial enterprise and preeminence are so powerfully they address themselves to it; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and who, in obedience to the all-powerful in every direction were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes for your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety: disowning whatever may be the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.
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to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for the apprehension that any discord may disturb our Union, it occurs as the bonds of our political system are the result of geographical discriminations—northern and southern—Atlantic and western; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the exponents of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head. They have seen in the negotiation by the executive—and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate—of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event throughout the United States, proof of how unjustified were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses of a division of two thirds for that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a Constitution of government better calculated than your former Constitution to unite the Union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its franchises, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very end and object of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction; to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of a party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the executive character of the general government. Plans digested by common councils and modified by mutual interests. However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which by cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance oppositions to its acknowledged authority but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the Constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of opinions and institutions, that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country, that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypotheses and opinion exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypotheses and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the preservation of its liberty is indispensable; liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guard.
purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be by force of public opinion to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest in stead of subservience to political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them painful and unhappy. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious, should consider the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one and thus to create, what was once foreign influence is one of the most powerful means ancient and modern, some of them painful and unhappy. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.
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Observe good faith and justice toward nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all; religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted sense of obligation, a sentiment which gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

…
impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and surrender their interests of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people for permanent and necessary advantages.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in ordinary combinations and collisions, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may judge it our interest to contract extensive and amicable commercial relations with them. With many of these nations, trade is already solicited by us, and by them. We have nothing to fear from commerce with them, and have much to lose by refusing it.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they may be always followed to the letter; yet so far as public reason and spirit shall be on our side we ought never to relinquish them. The causes of my disentangling ourselves from Europe are the same that ought to engage us in alliances with her; and what he has done in the way of public policy may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations. The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet unformed institutions and to progress to great and happy purposes of improvement and achievement. I have not yielded to the insinuation of those who would, by the temporary aid of foreign combinations, enable the government to suppress the objections of its enemies; or of others who would be false to the principles which have been deloited, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I safely and satisfactorily conformed, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take—and was bound in duty and interest to take—a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, from the manner of my understanding the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.
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In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.
tenure as Acting Director of National Intelligence and Director of National Counterterrorism Center concluded last week.

Joe Maguire spent 36 years serving our Nation as a U.S. Navy special operator. His record included SEAL Team 2 and the U.S. Navy Special Warfare Command, where he guided some of our Nation’s most sensitive military operations.

Admiral Maguire retired from the Navy in 2007, but it was not long before public service came calling again. In 2018, the President asked him to direct the NCTC. The Senate confirmed him on a voice vote.

He took on an even more challenging assignment last summer when he agreed to follow our former colleague Senator Dan Coats and act in the role of the DNI.

Our Nation asks our intelligence community to fulfill an enormous array of missions. These men and women work day and night to protect the homeland from terrorists. They keep watch on dangerous adversaries, like Russia and China. They guard against what hostile intelligence services are doing in our Nation, and they work to protect American elections from foreign interference that seeks to sow division and chaos and reduce public confidence in our democracy.

I recommend that adversaries, including Russia, are likely continuing efforts aimed at dividing Americans, sowing chaos in our politics, and undermining confidence in our elections. Fortunately, in stark contrast to the failures of the Obama administration in 2016, the Trump administration, once again, appears to be doing the right thing—in this case, by promptly providing a specific counterintelligence briefing to a Democratic Presidential candidate in question. This is just the latest example of the vigilance and the action we have seen from this administration on this crucial issue.

In parallel with hundreds of millions that Congress has appropriated in new election security assistance for State and local authorities, the administration has taken major proactive steps. The Treasury Department has sanctioned numerous Russian entities involved in the 2016 interference. The Department of Homeland Security has worked with States, local jurisdictions, and the private sector to bolster our cyber security defenses.

The Obama administration’s naïve and belated efforts failed to deter or to defend against Russian interference in 2016 and failed to provide substantive counterintelligence briefings to the Trump and Clinton campaigns. By contrast, the Trump administration has been vigilant and appears to be providing timely warnings to candidates affected by foreign intelligence activities. They are important to us all, and it wouldn’t be possible without the hard work of our intelligence community to identify the hostile activities.

This is just one of many critical tasks the intelligence community performs for our country. Our country is safer and stronger when they have the tools and the resources they need and leadership that understands that political bias must have no quarter in intelligence work and that all Americans’ rights need protecting.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on another matter, this week the Senate will continue to fulfill both of our constitutional charges. We will vote on important legislation, and we will provide advice and consent on a number of Presidential nominations. We will begin with two nominations to the Federal bench in U.S. territories.

Judge Robert Molloy, who currently sits on the U.S. Virgin Islands Superior Court, is nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Virgin Islands for a term of 10 years. Judge Silvia Carreno-Coll currently serves as a U.S. magistrate judge for the District of Puerto Rico and has been nominated to be a U.S. District judge. Both nominations were reported out of committee on a voice vote.

This week we will also consider Katherine MacGregor, the President’s nominee to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, and Travis Greene, a nominee to serve as judge on the U.S. Tax Court for a term of 15 years.

But first, following the first two nominations, the Senate will turn to important legislation put forward by Senators Graham and Sasse to expand protections for innocent lives. Senator Graham’s Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would finally remove seven nations, including China and North Korea, that permit elective abortion after 20 weeks. It would bring our Nation’s regard for the unborn off this sad and radical fringe and bring us more in line with the global mainstream.

I do not believe this legislation should be controversial, but even less controversial should be Senator Sasse’s Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It would simply ensure that infants who survive abortion attempts receive the same level of professional care as any other children.

My colleagues and I will have more to say on this subject in the days ahead, but I will urge all Senators to join me in supporting these nominees and these pieces of legislation when we vote on them this week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Ernst). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer, Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a period of ten years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate Black History Month and to pay tribute to Pennsylvanians whose work has made a real difference in our Commonwealth.

This year we will honor three individuals who have dedicated themselves to uplifting the lives of others. We know that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said: ‘Life’s most persistent and urgent question is: ‘What are you doing for others?’ For purposes of today’s remarks, I will substitute one word. I will substitute the word “children” for the word “others” and ask: What are you doing for our children?

It is an important question, not only for those of us who gather for Black History Month today and to celebrate this month, but it is also an important question for every Member of Congress to ask themselves.

This year we are going to honor these three Pennsylvanians: Kathy Elliott, Rosemary Browne, and Ellyn Jo Waller. All three have dedicated their lives to answering this urgent question and to building pathways toward hope for children in their communities.

I can think of no calling more important and no mission more essential than this one: to help our children. It is an honor for me to have the privilege to recognize these remarkable Pennsylvanians. They are beacon in their communities, and they are each, in their own way, an inspiration to me in my work in the Senate and, I know, to the work of our staff as well.

American children face a crisis created by policy choices made by adults over now several decades. Despite low unemployment and overall economic growth, children are being left out and left behind. Almost half of young children in the United States of America live in poverty or near poverty, with infants and toddlers at greatest risk.

It is important to ask ourselves why this is the case. It is also important to ask ourselves what we as a country can do to help our children. It is an urgent question for us to ask ourselves. It is an urgent question for our children. It is an urgent question for us all.

I do not believe this legislation should be controversial, but even less controversial should be Senator Sasse’s Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It would simply ensure that infants who survive abortion attempts receive the same level of professional care as any other children.
Nearly half of children live in these circumstances. According to the Census Bureau’s “Supplemental Poverty Measure,” which takes into account many of the government programs designed to assist low-income families and individuals, childhood poverty worsened—in 2017 for the first time since the Great Recession.

Poverty harms children both immediately and for a lifetime, the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine concluded in their 2019 seminal report, “A Roadmap to Reducing Child Poverty.” They found that poverty itself, especially when it occurs in early childhood or is persistent over time, is damaging to children in ways that last a lifetime.

Specifically, the report finds the following—and I am quoting the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine: “We find overwhelming evidence that a child growing up in a family whose income is below the poverty line experiences worse outcomes than a child from a wealthier family in virtually every dimension, from physical and mental health, to educational attainment and labor market success, to risky behaviors and delinquency.”

“This is a crisis of untapped potential opportunities. It is a crisis, as well, of contributions not made. When a child faces obstacles to becoming the person he or she might become, it is a profound tragedy that affects all of us because we are denying not just that child but also that family, that child’s family, their community and our country the contributions that child could make if we were investing in that child.

Over time, corrupt forces have perverted the basic notions of freedom while creating a society that works for corporate interests rather than our children’s best interests. Freedom, as we know, is not simply the right to be left alone. Real freedom must include the opportunity—the affirmative ability—to achieve one’s dreams.

A country that claims to support the freedom of its people must provide opportunities to its citizens. For example, in his second inaugural address, President Obama said the following:

“We do not believe that in this country freedom is reserved for the lucky, or happiness for the few. We recognize that not everyone responsibly lives our lives, any one of us, at any time, may face a job loss, or a sudden illness, or a home swept away in a terrible storm. The commitments we make to each other...these things do not sap our initiative, they strengthen us. They don’t make us a nation of takers; they free us to take the risks that make this country great.

President Obama was right, and he knew then that there were and are today extraordinary people across the country who are working to give our children the opportunity to achieve and grow and contribute so much to our Nation.

Today I will speak about three women who are doing this work in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: first, Rosemary Browne of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. For over 35 years, Rosemary Browne has been a leader in South Central Pennsylvania. During that time, she has held a number of critical roles in both the government sector and the nonprofit sector.

She is currently the President and CEO of Alder Health Services, the mission of which is to improve the health and well-being of persons living with AIDS and other populations, including LGBTQ youth, in community in a culturally competent, affirming, and empowering environment. The agency provides behavioral health, primary care, care management, wellness services, HIV/STD testing and treatment, family planning, and a host of other programs.

Critically, Alder Health provides a safe haven for LGBTQ youth, and we know that significant progress has been made in advancing the rights of LGBTQ individuals. However, that progress has, and we are still falling far short, for example, in serving transgender young people, especially transgender young people of color who face disproportionately higher rates of suicide and violence. Alder Health, under Rosemary Browne’s leadership, has played an indispensable role in helping us better understand the challenges of LGBTQ adolescents and providing them with the services they need.

In 2018 Rosemary was appointed to Governor Tom Wolf’s Pennsylvania Commission on LGBTQ Affairs, the first-of-its-kind statewide commission in the Nation. Rosemary’s work at Alder builds on her primary work at the Highmark Foundation, where she led efforts to address emerging community health challenges and to make sure that uninsured and underserved populations in South Central Pennsylvania had the attention and the services they needed for capacity. In this capacity, she spearheaded efforts to address bullying in our schools and our communities as a public health problem and also provided leadership on a strategy to reduce childhood obesity through school and community-based partnerships.

Prior to her work at Highmark Foundation, Rosemary spent a decade at the Foundation for Enhancing Communities as a program officer and then director of programs and community investment, where she oversaw tens of millions of investment in community services and tuition assistance, giving hundreds of area college-bound students the opportunity to pursue higher education.

Over her career, Rosemary Browne has heeded the call of service and lent her considerable passion and expertise in many different capacities. Whatever the role, the work has been the same: putting a spotlight on the needs of the underserved populations—LGBTQ youth, girls of color, and other underserved populations who lack access to healthcare, higher education—and always—always—helping them to obtain the services they need and to remove the obstacles that stand between them and their full potential.

Service has always been a part of Rosemary’s work, believing, as she does, that we are given resources and influence not for ourselves but for others.

Also, like Rosemary Browne, Dr. Kathi Elliott’s career has been defined by her service to others and to the children who are the people of Pennsylvania. In this case, in Southwestern Pennsylvania, Kathi came to this work naturally, having had those values instilled in her by her late mother, the former police commander of Pittsburgh, Gwen Elliott.

We have had South Central Pennsylvania with Rosemary Browne. Now we are in Southwestern Pennsylvania with Dr. Kathi Elliott.

Kathi’s mom, Gwen, the late police commander, was a blazer and someone whose story also should be told. We don’t have time for two stories in one family today, but I will tell part of Gwen’s story as well.

Gwen was one of the first African-American women officers in the Pittsburgh Police Department, joining the department in 1976 and eventually rising to the rank of commander. In 2002, Gwen founded Gwen’s Girls, an organization dedicated to empowering girls and young women through holistic, gender-specific programs, education, and experiences through after school—school and community-based programming throughout the communities in Southwestern Pennsylvania. Gwen’s Girls has grown to provide service throughout the region with sites in Pittsburgh, Wilkinsburg, and Clarendon, PA.

Given her mother’s leadership, it is no surprise that Dr. Kathi Elliott has demonstrated the same commitment to advocacy, development, and empowerment of girls.

Prior to accepting the position of CEO of Gwen’s Girls in 2015, Kathi spent years providing leadership in social service, community, and individual mental health treatment. Kathi began her career as a victim advocate at the Center for Victims, working mostly in the juvenile justice space. She also remains a practicing psychiatric nurse practitioner. In that capacity, she provided consultation, medication management, and clinical consultation services and treatment at the VA of Pittsburgh—their outpatient mental health clinic.

Dr. Elliott completed dual master’s degrees in nursing and social work from the University of Pittsburgh and earned a doctor of nursing practice degree from Chatham University in 2014. Through Dr. Elliott’s leadership, Gwen’s Girls has become recognized as a frontrunner in the integration of evidence-based practice and intervention policies and practices that enhance the child and social welfare system.
Gwen’s Girls convenes an annual equity summit for Black girls to address the racial and gender biases that exist within the juvenile justice, health and wellness, child welfare, and education systems.

Dr. Waller has also remained a constant leading force and convener of the Black Girls Equity Alliance—a collaboration of over 75 stakeholders committed to addressing systemic inequities in the juvenile justice, child welfare, education, and healthcare systems.

Dr. Waller currently serves on the board of trustees at Chatham University. In December 2017, she was appointed by Mayor Bill Peduto to serve as a commissioner on the newly formed Gender Equity Commission for the City of Pittsburgh.

Our third honoree today, Dr. Ellyn Jo Waller, though she was born in Queens, NY, we are proud to call her a daughter of Pennsylvania. Many in Philadelphia know her and a leader at Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church, as well as the partner, in both life and ministry, of Dr. Alyn Waller, senior pastor of Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church. Ellyn Jo Waller earned a bachelor of education from Temple University, a master of education in curriculum, instruction, and technology in education, and a doctor of education and curriculum, instruction, and technology in education, with an emphasis on literary education, from Temple University.

Dr. Waller has devoted her passion and her time to promoting women’s education and empowerment. She has especially devoted much of her time to combating human trafficking, both here in the United States and internationally. She is an active member of the Philadelphia Anti-Human Trafficking Coalition and serves as cochair of the religion subcommittee.

In 2004, Dr. Waller founded She’s My Sister, an anti-human trafficking ministry at Enon Tabernacle Church. She’s My Sister works to ensure that the faith community in Greater Philadelphia is aware of the issue of human trafficking and also partners with the Greater Philadelphia Salvation Army on the issue of participating in street outreach, supporting and strengthening the drop-in centers, and advocating on behalf of victims of human trafficking and sexual exploitation.

In August of 2015, under Dr. Waller’s leadership, the ministry hosted its inaugural Human Trafficking Awareness 5K Walk/Run to raise funds for a transitional residential program for young women exiting the life and aging out of the child welfare system.

Internationally, Dr. Waller regularly participates in rescue and restoration efforts in Italy and South Africa. Dr. Waller also serves on a number of boards and provides community leadership in other ways. She is a member of the board of the City School in Philadelphia, on the advisory committee of the United Negro College Funds, Delta-ware Valley Women of Faith for Education annual luncheon, and is president of the Charitas Foundation, which is the philanthropic Waller family foundation established to positively impact the lives of individuals by sowing financial seeds into organizations that change lives through their missions.

Dr. Waller has served on the Foundation Board of the Community College of Philadelphia since 2014 and currently serves as the president of the Foundation Board.

Each of our honorees today—these three remarkable women—have worked tirelessly to ensure that our children can flourish and can fulfill their potential. When others may look the other way or even wash their hands of the solemn duty to help our children, our honorees have instead volunteered for service over and over again.

To refer back to the first question I started with, “What are you doing for our children,” each of us has an obligation to answer that question. Each of our three honorees today have answered that question by devoting their lives to the urgent work of helping our children. These three remarkable women—all Pennsylvanians—have provided pathways to hope. For that, we owe them our deepest gratitude. 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. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this week, the Senate will vote on two bills that will protect our most vulnerable citizens—literally, our babies. The first bill we will vote on is the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which was introduced by our colleague from Nebraska, Senator Sasse.

This legislation is simple and straightforward. It requires physicians and healthcare providers to treat babies who survive an abortion with the same lifesaving care that other infants born at the same stage receive. While you might be forgiven for wondering, why would we need such a bill; surely, that standard must already exist in our law. Unfortunately, there are no Federal laws requiring healthcare providers to care for abortion survivors, just as they would for any other infant in their care.

One of the most notorious reasons why we need this law sits in the Governor’s mansion in Virginia. About this time last year, our country was shocked and outraged by comments made by Gov. Ralph Northam—a pediatrictian, believe it or not—about what should happen if a baby is delivered and survives an abortion. He said:

The infant would be delivered. The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated if that’s what the mother and family desired. And then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother.

Rather than immediately doing everything possible to save the baby, to provide the same sort of care he would to any infant, he wants to sit around and decide whether the baby will live or die. That is not healthcare; that is infanticide. Voting for the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is how each Member of this Chamber can go on record to say they are against killing innocent babies.

While some are desperately trying to portray this as an anti-abortion bill, which would infringe on women’s reproductive rights, those claims could not be further from the truth. There is nothing in this bill about limiting access to abortion, no mention of first, second, or third trimester abortions, nothing about overturning Roe v. Wade.

There is one goal with this legislation and one goal only: to give every baby a fighting chance. In a rational world, we wouldn’t have this discussion but would, rather, unanomously be condemning this practice for the evil that it is. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the bill and, once again, vote to stop the practice of infanticide and protect babies who survive abortions alive.

We will be voting on a second bill, which will provide protections for un-born children that are practiced in almost all of the civilized world. This is the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act that would make it a crime for doctors to perform abortions on un-born babies at or beyond 20 weeks.

There is significant medical research that demonstrates that unborn children at this stage experience pain. At 5 months into a pregnancy, these babies are beyond halfway to delivery.

One of President Trump’s guests at this year’s State of the Union, as was 2-year-old Ellie Schneider—one of the youngest babies to survive in the United States. Ellie was born at 21 weeks and 6 days—just 13 days beyond the point in time we are discussing. She weighed less than a pound at birth and is living proof of the medical achievements and advancements that have improved the chance of survival for extremely premature babies.

Ellie and her mother Robin are an ex- ample of the impact this legislation would have on the lives of many Americans families. Unfortunately, just as our Democratic colleagues have tried to deceive the American people about the purpose of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, they are trying to mislead everyone about what this bill would do as well.

First, this bill would apply only to elective abortions, not those involving rape or incest or where the life of the mother could be in danger. It in no way would we wouldn’t be having this discussion by seeking an abortion. It clearly and solely places responsibility on healthcare providers.
Passing this legislation wouldn’t make the United States an extreme outlier when it comes to abortion practices. In fact, it would put us in line with international norms. Currently, only seven countries in the world allow elective abortions after 20 weeks, of course, is the United States. The other countries on the list should make all of us second-guess allowing abortions beyond 20 weeks—China, Vietnam, North Korea. Countries with a history of human rights violations are hardly the model we should aspire to.

It is time to give every baby a chance to live and stop doctors from performing abortions on infants who feel pain. I am proud to be a cosponsor of both of these bills and stand with my colleagues in the fight for human life.

Our friend from Montana, Senator Daines, established the first-ever Senate Pro-Life Caucus to fight for the lives of our most vulnerable citizens. A couple of weeks ago, he said: "These back-to-back votes will present an opportunity for Senate Democrats and all of us to show the American people whether there are any limits at all to radical abortion extremism." We will soon find the answer.

I appreciate our colleagues—Senator Sasse, Senator Graham, and Senator Daines—for their leadership on this legislation and for consistently fighting for the most vulnerable among us.

I wish we "yes" votes on all of these bills—to protecting newborn babies, yes to equal medical care for all infants, and yes to a fighting chance for all babies.

**CORONAVIRUS**

Madam President, we are returning to Washington, DC, from time spent in our States. I was happy, for one, to get time to spend in Texas with constituents. I traveled the State, as I am sure many of us did, traveling from Midland, to Ft. Worth, to Corpus Christi, and a number of spots in between. Texas is a pretty big place, so it takes a little time to move around, but it is really great to be able to hear from the folks I represent—the folks we all represent—about what they care about the most.

One of the most interesting things to me is how little they talk about what is talked about inside the bubble here known as Washington, DC. In San Antonio, for example, I met with State and county officials who are working to safeguard public health. I met with local healthcare professionals, advocates, and patients to hear their stories about these rising costs, and I have introduced legislation to address them. For example, we heard from Randall Barker and his daughter Emma, who both have diabetes. They need insulin. They told me that one bottle of insulin costs upwards of $281. Randall continues to make sacrifices to afford the lifesaving drugs he and Emma need to lead healthy lives.

As I mentioned, to address the high cost of prescription drugs, I introduced a bipartisan bill with my colleague, Senator Blumenthal from Connecticut, called the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act. The purpose of the bill is straightforward: to stop drug companies from gaming the patent system to keep their profits high.

Patents, of course, are granted for scientific innovations in order to encourage more of them. What happens when companies, or their lawyers, decide they have a monopoly? That whatever the item is—in this case, a drug—that company reserves the right to sell it exclusively, without any competition, in order to recoup its costs and incentivize innovation when it comes to these drugs. But when companies game the system by establishing patent thickets—multiple patents used to unfairly block competition—this prevents new drugs, as well as competing drugs at a lower price, from entering the market.

For example, the most widely prescribed drug in America is called HUMIRA. It has more than 120 different patents, for no real purpose other than extending that period of exclusivity as long as possible to continue to make money. In Europe, there are five competing products, but in America, there is only HUMIRA. That is a patent thicket. That is gaming the system, and it is hurting American consumers.

I appreciate the support from healthcare providers and advocates and patients I heard from in Ft. Worth. They encourage us to get our work done sooner rather than later. I have come to the floor twice and asked unanimous consent to pass the bill. It was voted unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee. The Democratic leader blocked it both times. I hope he will reconsider his position. I am sure his constituents in New York would like a little bit of a break when it comes to prescription drug costs. I happen to think it has to do more with the upcoming election than it does the merits of the legislation.

**E-CIGARETTES**

Madam President, I traveled to a couple of other Texas cities, where I was able to talk to people about the rise of e-cigarette use, particularly among teens. In Corpus Christi along the Gulf coast, and as far away as West Texas, I met with a range of local officials, health professionals, and community advocates about the impact of teen vaping.

One study found that in the Permian Basin, a focus of oil production of the Odessa area, about half of high school students used e-cigarettes and 25 percent of them had vaped in the past month. This study found that in schools, the average age of first-time e-cigarette users is just 13 years old. E-cigarettes—even the closed systems, where you can’t add other ingredients, like the psychoactive ingredient in marijuana, THC—even in the closed systems that are designed to deliver only nicotine, nicotine is an addictive drug. When children get access to these addictive drugs, it may well end up being a gateway to other use—whether it is tobacco or other drug use—later in life. It certainly encourages them to remain a user of this nicotine delivery device.

I have introduced legislation called the Preventing Online Sales of E-Cigarettes to Children Act, which would make it difficult for children to get their hands on these devices, particularly on the internet. All it does is apply the same safeguards already in place for online purchases of tobacco—it applies that to e-cigarettes. Customers would have to verify their age at the time of delivery—a practice which, shockingly, does not currently exist.

A recent survey published in the American Journal of Health Promotion found that 32 percent of underage e-cigarette users reported purchasing products online, making online sales the single largest source of purchases for underage users. We recently raised the age from 18 to 21 to get access to these e-cigarettes, but still, as these studies...
This week, members of the DAV Department of Arkansas are visiting the Nation’s Capital to share the organization’s legislative priorities for 2020. They are part of an extensive network that has been influential in identifying how the Department of Veterans Affairs can help veterans. They are among the DAV members from across the country who are in Washington, DC, to advocate on behalf of veterans.

There is simply no substitute for coming to our Nation’s Capital and visiting with Members of Congress to let them know of DAV’s priorities. These include strengthening veterans mental healthcare and suicide prevention programs, improving benefits and services for women veterans and ensuring veterans who have been exposed to toxic substances receive full and timely benefits. The good news is we are working on these priorities because we all agree that our veterans deserve nothing less than quality care and the benefits they have earned.

Last month, the Senate’s Committee on Veterans’ Affairs advanced the Commander John Scott Hannon Veterans Mental Health Care Improvement Act. This comprehensive legislation will strengthen our ability to provide veterans with the mental healthcare they need. It includes language Senator WARNER and I authored to leverage the services of veteran-serving nonprofits and other community networks in our overall strategy to reduce veteran suicides.

VA Ranking Member TESTER and I are also working to improve services to our women veterans. Our Deborah Sampson Act legislation would eliminate barriers to care and services that many women veterans face and would help to ensure the VA could address the needs for women, which is so critical because they are more likely to face homelessness, unemployment, and to go on public welfare. We are pleased to have the support of the DAV for this important legislation.

I am proud to cosponsor the Veterans Burn Pit Exposure Recognition Act, which would allow veterans who suffer from the effects of burn pits to get the benefits and services they have earned. I encourage my colleagues to support these bills so we can provide the resources that have been promised to our veterans.

For years, the DAV members have supported the passage of the Blue Water Navy bill. Thanks, in part, to their advocacy, Congress approved this critical legislation last year that extends benefits to more veterans who were exposed to toxic chemicals during the Vietnam war.

The DAV’s attention extends beyond the halls of Congress. Its National Service Program helps to direct services to veterans across the country.

I am proud to note that more than 11,000 DAV members in Arkansas whose outreach is helping veterans to understand and access their benefits. They have spent countless hours in advising fellow veterans about the assistance they qualify for and in helping them fill out the paperwork to secure those benefits through the VA.

One of the well-known services provided by the DAV is the transportation of veterans to VA medical centers and hospitals. In rural States like Arkansas, the services these volunteers offer is critical to meeting veterans’ healthcare needs. The Arkansas fleet is made up of 16 vans. Last year, more than 6,600 veterans were driven to medical appointments with the help of volunteers who logged more than 18,000 hours behind the wheel.

I look forward to continuing to work with DAV members as Congress crafts and reforms policies to improve services for veterans and their families.

This country made a promise to our veterans that we must live up to, and I am proud to join with the DAV to ensure we follow through on this commitment. In working together, we can find solutions and take action to deliver the results veterans have earned and expect. We will continue looking to the DAV to understand how we can improve the lives of the men and women who have served our country.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and as chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that oversees VA funding, I have seen the dedication of the DAV in support of disabled veterans in Arkansas and across the country. I am proud to recognize the DAV on its 100 years of engaging veterans, in its advocating to advance benefits, services, and care, and in its making a positive difference in the lives of veterans and their families.

REMEMBERING CHARLES PORTIS

Madam President, on a separate subject, I also pay tribute to an Arkansas veteran who is one of the State’s most famous sons—literary icon Charles Portis. Mr. Portis, the author best known for his 1968 Western novel “True Grit,” passed away on February 17, 2020.

Born in December 1933, in El Dorado, AR, Portis spent his childhood in southern Arkansas. He enlisted in the Marine Corps and served as an infantryman and, during the Korean war, reached the rank of sergeant before his discharge in 1955. Following his military service, he attended the University of Arkansas and worked for the student newspaper, the Arkansas Traveler. He graduated from the university in 1958 with a degree in journalism.

After graduating, Portis began his career as a reporter. He first worked at the Arkansas Gazette and then at the New York Herald Tribune. Though he voluntarily ended his journalism career in 1964, he used the skills and tools he had acquired as a reporter when he returned home to Arkansas to begin writing fiction.

His most celebrated work is the Western classic “True Grit.” This book chronicles the efforts of a Yell County...
teenager, Mattie Ross, along with U.S. Marshal Rooster Cogburn, to avenge the death of Mattie's father at the hands of a drifter. The novel incorporates distinct references that are familiar to many Arkansans, and it depicts life on the frontier in what was then called the West. It was later adapted into film in 1969 and 2010. While it is his most well-known work, Mr. Portis also wrote four other novels and several shorter works of fiction and nonfiction.

During his career, Portis was honored with the Oxford American’s first Lifetime Achievement in Southern Literature award and was presented with the Porter Prize’s 30th Anniversary Lifetime Achievement Award. “True Grit” has been praised as “one of the great American novels.”

I take this opportunity to say how proud we are of Charles Portis and his legacy as an acclaimed writer and storyteller. My thoughts and prayers are with his family as they remember and reflect on his life. I hope they find comfort in the fact that Mr. Portis has left a profound, lasting mark on Arkansas, as well as within our Nation’s culture and literary traditions.

Charles Portis had a remarkable career that will be remembered for a long time to come. I wish to honor him and his loved ones today and help to celebrate his life. On behalf of all Arkansans, we celebrate Charles Portis and his notable contributions to our State. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MONDY. Madam President, I am pleased to have arrived on the Senate floor just a bit early to have heard the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. BOOZMAN, pay tribute to the DAY, Disabled American Veterans, and I very much want to join in his comments. I would like to take this moment to thank him for his continual service for veterans, not only for those of Arkansas but of our Nation, and to recognize that he and I, since our days in the House of Representatives, have worked together on veterans’ issues and both of our Nations, and to recognize him for his continual service for veterans, not only for those of Arkansas but of our Nation. You will be missed at the Kansas Association of Broadcasters, but I have no doubt you will continue to make your community a better place.

I look forward to many more years of friendship and working on behalf of Kansans and I thank you for your friendship and for all you have done to make our State a better place. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this week the Senate has another chance to vote on basic pro-life protections for babies, both born and unborn.

I stand before you today to champion the choice to live up to our Nation’s highest principle—that every person has the right to life—or to stoop down to a narrow vision of humanity peddled by the abortion industry and its cronies.

The first bill we are considering—the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—would prohibit abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, when there is clear, scientific evidence that these young babies can feel pain in their mother’s womb.

The abortion lobby and all of its defenders will dispute this science, claiming that babies or fetuses—which is the euphemism they like to use for babies—can’t feel pain at all or at least until the very latest stages of pregnancy. Anyone pedaling that myth must have never visited a neonatal intensive care unit, or the NICU, as they are usually called, or been one of those NICU nurses who cares for little preemies, even micro-preemies, and they will tell you how they can hold that small infant sometimes even in the palm of their hands, and they can see it grimace at a poke or a prod, maybe even slap away a tube or a needle as they approach—just as older kids do, just as some grownups do.

The undeniable fact of fetal pain in these young babies influences every aspect of how we care for the young in our hospitals. We swaddle them with little bodies are so easily stimulated. We give them pain medicine during surgery, whether they are in the womb

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this week the Senate has another chance to vote on basic pro-life protections for babies, both born and unborn.
or outside it. But we offer no such comfort during abortions, even in the latest stages of pregnancy, when abortionists crush a baby’s skull and dismember it.

Indeed, a scientific paper published earlier this year in the Journal of Medical Ethics noted a curious fact: Abortion is the only—the only—invasive procedure performed on unborn infants without pain medication. Then again, abortion is unusual in so many ways, as so few hospital procedures are designed not to safeguard the patient’s life.

Are we comfortable with this state of affairs? Are we comfortable with the fact that more than 11,000 abortions were performed after 21 weeks when, again, we have clear, scientific evidence that these babies feel pain and that many of them could survive outside their mother’s womb?

I would suggest the American people are not comfortable with this situation, and we can do something about it in this Congress.

The second bill we are voting on, called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, is even more modest but perhaps even more urgent. This bill would simply protect babies when they are born alive during an abortion.

I know it is amazing to even hear this, but there are rare and horrible cases in which babies are intended to be aborted, yet they are born alive, and the doctors have no obligation to provide medical care for that young baby with a spark of God living in its soul. So this bill would simply obligate abortionists to render lifesaving medical care to a baby struggling for life on the operating table. It would require abortionists to act as those babies’ friends and their doctors, consistent with their oath—not act like the baby’s mortal enemy.

Of course, the abortion lobby will tell you: Nothing never occurs. All of their defenders in the media will say that it never occurs. But if you are being honest, the facts are, they do occur.

The implication here is clear. They simply want us to look away from this horror. That doesn’t mean we should, though, because, in fact, we do know—we do know—that babies can survive abortions. We have the numbers to prove it from a handful of States that require abortionists to confess when they fail to kill a baby in the mother’s womb. Instead, murder it on the operating table.

In Florida, 11 babies were born alive during abortions in 2017; another 6 were reportedly born alive in 2018; and another 2, last year. There were 19 premature births born alive during abortions in just 1 State in just 3 years. Other States have reported dozens more cases.

Still, the abortion industry will dismiss these lives as a mere rounding error. Let’s not even focus on it. It is not a serious matter.

But forgive us if most Americans see the matter differently. These are precious little children, made in the image of God and endowed by him with the same worth and dignity as you and me and all of us.

We have a duty to these little children. We have a duty not to look away from this.

These pro-life bills are modest and humane. They have the strong support of the American people—clear majorities. But the real reason we must protect these babies is not because it is popular but because it is right. Every human being is created equal and deserves recognition and protection under our laws. It says so right in the preamble to our Declaration of Independence.

Our country doesn’t always live up to that noble principle. But right now we have an opportunity to live up to it just a little bit more, if only in just a few more cases—but those cases in which life is most vulnerable and most innocent. So I urge my colleagues to seize this opportunity and protect life by acknowledging the humanity of these precious little children. We must not look away any longer.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, well, the World Health Organization has now reported that there are 79,000 cases of coronavirus in 30 countries, with at least 53 confirmed cases here in United States.

As the virus continues to spread, the global economy is already beginning to suffer. All of the warning lights are flashing bright red. We are staring down a potential pandemic, and the administration has no plan. We have a crisis of coronavirus, and President Trump has no plan, no urgency, no understanding of the facts or how to coordinate a response.

We must get a handle on the coronavirus and make sure the United States is fully prepared to deal with its potentially far-reaching consequences, but the Trump administration has been asleep at the wheel.

President Trump, good morning. There is a pandemic of coronavirus. Where are you? Where is your plan?

It is just amazing. As the crisis grows and grows, we hear nothing.

Coronavirus testing kits have not been widely distributed to our hospitals and public health labs.

President Trump’s State Department overruled the recommendations of the scientists in the CDC and allowed infected passengers from a cruise ship to be flown back into the United States.

Amazingly, at a time when we know that these pandemics can spread, this administration cut the CDC—the agency in charge of fighting these global viruses—with a 16-percent senseless cut to its budget.

My fellow Americans, that is what they do on all these things. They just cut, and then the President tries to claim credit after we restore the money. He did it in his State of the Union. He was claiming, because of his great work with NIH, we are curing cancer. He has cut the NIH every budget, including this. It is disgraceful how this man can say one thing and do another and confounding that it doesn’t catch up with him with too many Americans and none of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and it is probably, right now, the most dangerous and most egregious when it comes to coronavirus.

It wasn’t just that the President cut CDC last year. It follows years of drastic cuts to the global health division at CDC by the Trump administration.

In 2018, CDC was forced to reduce the numbers of countries it operated in from 49 to 10. That is how bad it is.

We have crises, and we have a world that is different, and this administration, instead of stepping up to the plate and waking away the clarion call of the right front: Just cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, no matter how it affects people.

In 2018, even worse, President Trump ordered the National Security Council to shutter its entire global health security unit and asked the Department of Homeland Security to do the same. We don’t have epidemic teams in the National Security Council or DHS.

I hope and pray to God that coronavirus doesn’t spread here, but if it does, we have been inadequate prepared because of President Trump’s lack of leadership, lack of understanding science, lack of ability to listen to experts and do something about them instead of being concerned—it seems all the time—with his own ego.

The President has not even taken the simple, sensible step of designating a single official to lead response efforts.

In 2014, President Obama made the smart decision to appoint Ron Klain to lead an interagency response to the Ebola outbreak. But President Trump, in contrast, has hollowed out so many agencies that one of the key figures responding to coronavirus is Ken Cuccinelli, an immigrant hard-liner with no experience in public health. Unbelievable. A man totally unprepared for coronavirus, an ideologue—a rightwing, nasty ideologue who has spent his career kicking around imme-

Party of China for silencing dissent and obscuring the truth about the coronavirus—where it originated. When China obscures the truth, it puts Americans in danger. Where is President Trump’s voice?

The videos emerging from behind the Chinese Communist Party’s internet wall show Chinese people pleading—with the international community to expose the scope and scale of this epidemic.

But being anti-science is not just rhetoric. It hurts us. It hurts every American in many ways, and that is what President Trump and his administration do, and our Republican colleagues just blithely go along.

After imposing an anti-interference crackdown around the Chinese Communist Party, after 3 years of cutting funding for our epidemic response programs, President Trump simply has left the United States unprepared to confront a possible coronavirus.

I will have more to say this week about what the administration must do to right the ship.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. President, on another front, again, the frustration of how this administration has conducted itself is unprecedented. I know some of my colleagues like to say that it is just like Obama. It isn’t even close.

Here are some more examples, unfortunately, on the trampling of the rule of law in this country.

Emboldened by the refusal of Senate Republicans to hold him accountable in his impeachment trial, President Trump has been interfering with the Justice Department and retaliating against officials in his administration who dare testify truthfully before Congress.

In the short week that we have spent in recess, the President has managed to plunge our country even deeper into chaos and certainly has shown the need for having a trial during impeachment with witnesses and documents, getting the truth and not rubberstamping President Trump’s behavior.

The President continued to purge his administration, firing officials who refused to pledge allegiance to the President over their allegiance to the Constitution. The President classified Bolton’s book in another blatant attempt to cover up the facts. This is what dictatorships do—dictatorships.

They say something is classified; they hide the truth. It is a disgrace.

The President continued to abuse the pardon power, in one instance commuting the sentence of a notoriously corrupt former official without rhyme or reason. Maybe most egregious of all, the President, angered that the Director of National Intelligence had the gall to conduct a bipartisan briefing for the House Intelligence Committee on foreign interference in our elections, replaced him with a political lackey—a yes-man as the head of DNI, where truth needs to be spoken probably more truthfully other place in the government. He has shown no presence in the intelligence community and is simply known as an acolyte to President Trump.

With each of these actions—I hate to say it, but that objective person will know—President Trump brings our Nation closer and closer to a banana republic, a government not of laws but of one man, a government where officials are asked to swear loyalty not to our country or the Constitution but to the President himself, a country where truth is obscured or covered up or deemed fake simply because it is not flattering to the President and is not what he wants to hear.

President Trump’s decision to dismiss the Director of National Intelligence, is particularly pernicious. Our intelligence community is an institution that is supposed to report on threats to our country with accuracy, without regard to politics, to speak truth to power, to protect us. For the President to install a yes-man at the top of the intelligence community, to politicize a part of our government designed to be apolitical, to so debase the morale of the brave men and women in the CIA and the NSA, many of whom risk their lives for our safety, is a disgrace.

There are media reports that our intelligence community has found that Putin continues to engage in activities to influence the outcome of our elections. That is reportedly what former DNI McQuire’s team was briefing Congress about.

So today, along with my Democratic colleagues on the Banking and Foreign Relations Committee, I am sending a letter to Secretary Pompeo and Secretary Mnuchin urging them to impose new sanctions on Putin and his cronies using existing sanctions authority. They have it, they can do it. Let me repeat that. The Trump administration has broad authority to impose sanctions for meddling in our elections. It does not need new legislative tools or approval.

Our message is clear: Secretary Mnuchin, impose sanctions now.

No one on the Intelligence Committee, Democrat or Republican, has disputed that Russia is attempting to interfere in our elections. Most say Russia has already started to do so. So this should be an easy, bipartisan effort. We are being attacked today in real time by foreign adversaries. This is not about party politics. It is not about what Trump doesn’t want to hear. The Russians wanted him to win in 2016 and in all likelihood will want him to win in 2020. We oaths to defend our Republic. Americans—I don’t care what their party, what their ideology—if they start believing our elections are not on the level, this democracy will be in big trouble.

I hope my Republican colleagues will join us. The administration could impose sanctions tomorrow, and it should. A repeat performance of 2016—an active campaign of foreign influence in our elections—is perhaps the greatest threat to our democracy.

The Founding Fathers thought so. Read what James Madison said.

Mr. President, I rise today to urge passage of bipartisan, compassionate legislation that I introduced on April 2 of last year with my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator Baldwin, to reauthorize the Lifespan Respite Care Program. This program provides respite services to family members who are caring for loved ones with special needs. Oftentimes, they are taking care of a spouse with Alzheimer’s disease or a child with several disabilities, and it is a 24/7 job. They need a break, they need help, and that is what respite service is all about.

This is not a new program. It has long been a bipartisan priority, and our bill is widely supported by a total of 190 leading caregiver and respite organization across the country.

The Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee reported our bill unanimously on October 31 of last year, and we have been working since then to secure its passage by the full Senate. It cleared the Republican side of the aisle on December 17, but the bill has been stalled on the other side of the aisle due to an unknown objection by an anonymous Senator, making it very difficult to re-introduce the bill. If you don’t know who has lodged the objection and you don’t know what the concern is, it becomes impossible to resolve it. Thankfully, I am pleased to report that the objection has now been lifted, and we are poised to pass this bill that will help our senior citizens caring for a spouse with Alzheimer’s or another disease, as well as parents caring for children with disabilities.

Our bill would authorize $10 million annually for the Lifespan Respite Care Program over the next 5 years to assist States in establishing or enhancing statewide lifespan respite programs. Since the program’s enactment 15
years ago, 37 States plus the District of Columbia have received grants to increase the availability and quality of respite services. Failing to reauthorize this program would put this funding in jeopardy. What respite care is the No. 1 service caregivers say they need. 85 percent of our Nation’s caregivers have not received any respite services at all. Respite care has been shown to help sustain family caregivers’ health and well-being and avoid and delay out-of-home placement for those for whom they are caring.

From families caring for children with disabilities to those caring for older adults, the need for respite care today continues to grow. Our bipartisan legislation would help the 45 million caregivers in our country who provide an estimated $470 billion in uncompensated care each year.

As a Senator representing the State of Ohio, the median age in our Nation and as chair of the Senate Aging Committee, the well-being of our seniors and their caregivers is among my top priorities. The need for respite care continues to outpace available resources. This program is an attempt to provide a modest amount of Federal grant money toward this goal.

Along with Senator BALDWIN, this bipartisan bill is cosponsored by Senators MURRAY, REED, and SINEMA. More than 50 national stakeholders have signed a letter urging immediate passage of the bill, including the ARCH National Respite Coalition, the AARP, Easterseals, The Arc, and the Elizabeth Dole Foundation. In addition, State-based organizations representing constituents across the country have also signed this letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

The being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

February 24, 2020.

Re Lifespan Respite Care Program Reauthorization Act (S. 995) to reauthorize the Lifespan Respite Care Program at $50 million over five years. We are very grateful that with your strong support, the bill was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee last October, and we now urge the Senate to take swift action to pass the bill.

We also want to acknowledge and express our deep gratitude to Rep. James Langevin for his championing of Lifespan Respite in the House since 2003, when he first introduced the Lifespan Respite Act in Congress. He continued to lead the effort with subsequent reauthorization bills in every Congress since.

Every day, millions of American families are faced with unexpected illness, disease, or disability. A soldier is injured in war, a spouse develops Alzheimer’s or Alzheimer’s disease, or a child is diagnosed with a developmental or physical disability or chronic illness. These are but a few examples of events that can forever change an individual’s and family’s trajectory.

While each situation is unique, the one thing that they often have in common is the incredible roles that families play. Forty-three million family caregivers provide a vast majority of our nation’s long-term care, permitting individuals of all ages to remain in their homes or avoid a delay nursing home or foster care placements.

While the benefits of family caregiving are plentiful, so is its toll. Respite—short-term care that offers individuals or family members temporary relief from the daily routine and stress of providing care—is a critical component to bolstering family stability and maintaining family caregiver health and well-being. Respite is a frequently requested support service among family caregivers, but 85% of family caregivers provide it without pay. The Lifespan Respite Care Program, though competitive grants to states to establish or enhance statewide Lifespan Respite systems, work to maximize existing resources and help ensure that quality respite is available and accessible to all family caregivers. With more than half of care recipients under age 75 and more than one-third age 90, rightly recognizes caregiving as a lifespan issue and serves families regardless of age or disability.

Though the program has been drastically underfunded since its inception, thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia have received grants and are engaged in impressive work such as identifying and coordinating respite services available through various state agencies, including veterans caregiver services; helping unserved families pay for respite through participant-directed voucher programs; addressing the workforce shortage by recruiting and training respite workers and volunteers; and building capacity by awarding mini-grants to community and faith-based agencies for new services; and raising awareness about respite through public education campaigns. Enactment of the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act is necessary to continue this excellent momentum, better coordinate and supply respite care to our nation’s 43 million family caregivers through statewide Lifespan Respite programs and ensure that states are able to sustain the great work they have begun and still allow families to receive a grant.

We thank you for your commitment to individuals living with disabilities, older individuals in need of assistance and support, and the loved ones they care for; and we look forward to continuing to work with you as the bill moves forward. If you would like more information, please contact Jill Kagan with the National Respite Coalition at jkagan@archrespite.org.

Sincerely,

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Alabama

Alabama Governor’s Office on Disability, Alabama Home Health Services, Alabama Lifespan Respite Resource Network, Alabama Lifespan Respite Coalition, Madison County 310 Board, North Alabama Community Care, United Cerebral Palsy of Alabama, United Cerebral Palsy of Mobile and Tenessee Valley, Inc., United Cerebral Palsy of Mobile and Central Alabama, West Alabama Area Agency on Aging.

Arizona

Arizona Caregiver Coalition, Benevilla, Pocan House Adult Day Services, SunTree Adult Day Health & School For Seniors.

California

Association of Caregiver Resource Centers, YMCA Childcare Resource Service.

Florida

Florida Lifespan Respite Alliance.

Idaho

Center for the Study of Aging, Families Together, John & Junes Mission, Inc., Idaho Caregiver Alliance, Kids 1st Disability Resource Center, Legacy Corps for Veteran and Military Families/Jannus, Rays for Rare, Relatives As Parents INC., Senior Connec-

Illinois

Illinois Respite Coalition.

Kansas

Kansas Lifespan Respite Coalition.
The old Republican slogan was “a chicken in every pot.” The new Republican slogan is “a Republican in every examination room.”

The Senate has done remarkably little legislating while under the recent control of the other party. Somehow, some way, there always seems to be time to have an attack on women’s healthcare. It has come up again and again, and it is always the same basic proposition on offers: Republicans trying to somehow squeeze themselves in between women and their physicians.

My view is that the government ought to make sure that women can get healthcare from the doctors they trust and that politicians ought to stay out of things. Roe v. Wade says that is supposed to be the law of the land when it comes to access to abortion. More than four decades of settled law says that these are choices to be made by women and their doctors, and the ideological agendas of politicians ought to have nothing to do with it. The legislation up for debate this week, based on another far-fetched argument, is the opposite. Amongst other problems, one of the proposals on offer this week would actually criminalize the practice of intensely personal healthcare. It would essentially say to doctors: Just throw out your training. Throw it away. Discard your medical judgment, and forget what is in the patient’s best interest.

Rightwing politicians are going to call the shots in the exam room. Doctors who provide necessary medical treatment and care that can be lifesaving could be thrown in jail if they run afoul of these new ideological government standards.

Now, this isn’t a debate just here in the Senate. There have been hundreds of bills brought forward in States across the country restricting women’s healthcare, including safe and legal abortion. Among the people hit hardest by these proposals are the millions of women in this country who are on single day walking an economic tightrope. If they can’t see the doctor they trust and if their local Planned Parenthood clinic is forced to shutter its doors because of these harsh new rules, they may not have anywhere else to turn to for vital healthcare. It is another way in which the right and the Republican agenda supporting it goes back to the days when healthcare was really just for the healthy and the wealthy.

Bottom line: This debate is fundamentally about whether the government gets to control women’s bodies. It is a dangerous, in my view, unconstitutional proposition that just throws in the garbage can decades of settled law. This Republican majority has proved that we can always find time here in the Senate to go after women’s healthcare with ideological bills, regardless of what other healthcare challenges Americans are facing at home. I guarantee that across this country right now there are persons lined up at

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF LIFESPAN RESPITE CARE PROGRAM.

(a) DATA COLLECTIION AND REPORTING.—Section 2904 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300i-3) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2904. DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State agency awarding a grant or cooperative agreement under section 2902 shall report such data, information, and metrics as the Secretary may require for purposes of—

“(1) evaluating State programs and activities funded pursuant to such grant or cooperative agreement, including the results pursuant to section 2902(d)(2)(B)(vii); and

“(2) identifying effective programs and activities funded pursuant to section 2902.

“(b) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2023, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives regarding the outcomes of the programs and activities funded pursuant to section 2902, including any effective programs and activities identified.”

(b) FUNDING.—Section 2905 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300i-4) is amended by striking “title” and all that follows through the period and inserting “title, $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through fiscal year 2024.”

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 995), as amended, was passed.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we are running a little bit behind, so I would ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, which reflects the amount of time we are running behind.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

WOMEN’S HEALTHCARE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate is having yet another debate on legislation to restrict healthcare for women, and I am going to take just a few minutes to talk about what this debate is really all about.

The Republican majority has proved that we can always find time here in the Senate to go after women’s healthcare with ideological bills, regardless of what other healthcare challenges Americans are facing at home. I guarantee that across this country right now there are persons lined up at
pharmacy counters with every last penny they have who know they are about to get mugged when it comes to paying for the cost of prescription medicine. Millions of Americans struggle to pay for their medications, but the majority of this body has blocked our best efforts to give them a hand. Instead, the Senate is debating yet another ideological attack on women’s healthcare that really has no chance of becoming law.

The likelihood is these attacks, in my view, based on what we know, are going to keep coming. It will only get more serious in the months ahead. Four more years of Donald Trump would mean the end of Roe v. Wade. It would guarantee more healthcare discrimination against women, and it would mean a whole lot more government control over women’s bodies. Again and again, we would see the government in the exam room. I urge my colleagues to reject these proposals when they come up. If I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move for the SENATE to close debate on the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURkowski), the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) would be listed under this body’s than yesterday.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote on this?
would help make sure that, when an infant has already been born, when the infant is alive, is breathing, is crying, is outside the womb, that child receives the medical attention he or she needs.

The second bill is the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act that would ban late-term abortions that result in pain and suffering and agony for an unborn child.

What you will not hear from congressional Democrats is that after 5 months, an unborn child’s toes and eyelids and fingers and eyelashes have already formed. He or she has a heartbeat and can feel pain, and science confirms this. We know that these late-term abortions, embraced by more and more radical partisans, produce pain and suffering and agony. We should not be a part of allowing the deliberate infliction of pain on a little girl or a little boy.

These two proposals, in any sane and rational world, would be agreed to unanimously. If you look at the last 3 years, we have seen enormous victories when it has come to defending life, when it has come to confirming 192 new Federal judges committed to following the Constitution: when it has come to restricting taxpayer funding of Planned Parenthood, the largest provider of abortions in this country; when it has come to defending the religious liberties of Americans all across this country, including the Little Sisters of the Poor. We are making major steps in the right direction, but we can go further. We can agree on these commonsense provisions. We can also test whether Senate Democrats agree with their colleagues running for President, whether Senate Democrats agree with the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who has said: If you are a pro-life Democrat, get out of the party; you are not welcome.

I certainly welcome pro-life Democrats to speak up for their values and defend their values, and we should come together behind commonsense propositions that say we should not be committing procedures that result in pain and agony and suffering, that science demonstrates causes that suffering, and we should not be allowing newborn infants to die because medical care is denied to those children.

This is why I am here to bring us together. I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand together for life—every life, as a precious, unique gift from God. Every life, whether the child has a disability, whether the child is valued or not, that child should be valued, should be protected because that child is precious.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it must be a day that ends in “Y” because, once again, Republican Senators are pushing for backward, ideological bills to restrict a woman’s constitutional right to abortion. Once again, Republicans are peddling a ban that is blatantly unconstitutional. Once again, they are pretending we don’t already have laws on the books that protect infants and are using that as a pretext to drum up fear and misunderstanding about one of the most heartbreaking situations a family can face, and are pushing for anti-doctor, anti-women, anti-family legislation.

Once again, I am here on behalf of women and all the country to deliver the same message we have already made clear countless times: not on our watch. Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has indicated he wants to pivot to legislating, which makes these two atrocious bills an interesting choice because all 100 Senators know they are going absolutely nowhere.

The truth is, Republicans’ charade today is not actually about passing laws any more than it is about people’s health or medical decisions best for patients. It is really about Republicans’ crass political calculation that they can fire up their far-right base with an all-out war against the constitutionally protected right to safe, legal abortion.

The two bills differ in some significant ways, but they have the same consequences. They would criminalize—criminalize—abortion, take deeply personal, often painful decisions out of the hands of parents and use scare tactics and misinformation to try to weaken strong public support for Roe.

Another thing they have in common? They have already been panned by leading medical groups. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has called one of these bills “an unconstitutional attempt to intimidate health care providers and prevent them from providing the safe care their patients want and need.” And they have said the other is “a gross legislative interference into the practice of medicine.”

It is not just medical experts. Families across the country have actually faced these decisions, have spoken out to make clear politicians should have no part in them. Pressing for these abhorrent bills year after year may be nothing more than a cynical political tactic for Republicans, but passing them would be an unconscionable exercise in cruelty to the people who would actually be affected.

People like Judy, who is from my home State of Washington. Judy learned over 20 weeks into her pregnancy that her son’s organs were not developing properly. One lung was 20 percent formed. The other was missing entirely.

People like Kate, whose doctor informed her that if her daughter survived birth, she would not be able to walk, talk, or swallow and likely would not even be comfortable enough to sleep.

People like Lindsay, who learned her daughter had a fast-growing, inoperable tumor growing into her brain and heart and lungs, wrapping around her neck and eyes and chest, and making her odds of survival incredibly slim.

People like Darla, who was pregnant with twins when she got the unthinkable news that one of her twins had severe genetic abnormalities, terminating that pregnancy could put her other twin’s healthcare at risk.

There are just a few of many stories. There are more families across the country who have struggled with the painful reality that the child they have hoped for cannot survive them. They have spoken out to underscore that in those wrenching moments, they wanted to make the decision that was best for their child and their family, with their healthcare provider. But each of these bills would take the ability to make the decision best for that child and family away from women like Judy, Kate, Lindsay, and Darla. Those bills would prevent doctors from offering the best medical advice, all because extreme politicians are more concerned with spreading misinformation and firing up their base than they are with actual women’s lives. In other words, in the most private moments of personal tragedy, these bills would take precedence over a family’s wishes as they grieve.

To the politicians supporting these bills, I have to ask: How dare you think your opinion is more important here than the knowledge of medical experts and the wishes of the family who is affected?

I don’t understand how anyone can think, instead of letting patients make their own very personal decisions, that they should have that decision made for them by President Trump and Vice President PENCE. That is exactly what we are talking about today. Why? Even though Roe v. Wade has been the law of the land for almost a half a century, even though a large majority of people do not want to see that landmark decision overturned, Republicans think somehow they can benefit politically and fire up the most ideological elements of their base by using every tool imaginable to chip away at the right to safe—safe—legal abortion.

I am here to say they can try, but women, medical experts, and those of us elected officials who trust them are not going to stop calling these bills what they are: anti-women, anti-doctor, and anti-family. We are going to make clear we oppose every single one of their efforts to further chip away at access to safe, legal abortion under Roe v. Wade, every extreme, cruel abortion ban, every fearmongering effort to gin up controversy and pretend we don’t already protect infants, every far-right judge they try to pack onto the courts to chip away at Roe v. Wade, every barrier to care and information like President Trump’s title X gag rule, and every new shameful scheme they concoct in their all-out war on access to reproductive healthcare.
Whatever Republicans try next, Democrats are going to continue fighting alongside women and men across the country to protect their ability to make their own decisions about their own families, continue standing up for doctors and patients. Providing reproductive care without politicians getting in the way, and lifting up the stories of real people, like Judy and Kate and Lindsey, Darla, and many others—so Republicans can’t ignore them.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I really disappointed to feel like I need to come to the floor today to respond to these anti-women, anti-family bills that have been introduced. Not only would these bills interfere with a woman’s ability to make her own reproductive choices, they would threaten doctors with prison time if they perform abortion services that women have a constitutional right to receive.

These bills are dangerous, extreme, and they are part of an ongoing effort by this administration to overturn Roe v. Wade. We don’t need this legislation to prevent the killing of infants.

Let me be clear, infanticide is already illegal under Federal law. In fact, prosecutions have occurred under the current law that prevents infanticide. This legislation would do nothing but set up ambiguous standards for cases where medical emergencies and add uncertainty to laws that are already on the books to prohibit infanticide.

This uncertainty will have a chilling effect on the ability of women to access the services they need in the United States. The legislation we are voting on would also imprison doctors for up to 5 years for performing abortions after a woman is 20 weeks pregnant, even though—even though Federal courts have ruled that this 20-week abortion ban, as is proposed under one of these bills, would violate the Constitution.

The 20-week abortion ban bill would only allow for exceptions for minors who are victims of rape or incest if those young women report that rape or incest to the police. For adult women, the rape exception would only apply if she waits 48 hours and gets counseling from a healthcare provider that her doctor is nothing but tragic. I don’t understand how people can think the government is better positioned to make these personal decisions than women and families and their doctors.

These bills and to vote no when they are introduced with Senator GRAHAM had the Medicaid expansion would be gone, States would have fewer dollars to cover more people at a time when 43 percent of childbirths in this country are covered and paid for by Medicaid. These are the fundamental issues that women and families rely on isn’t ripped away in court. I urge my colleagues to oppose these bills and to vote no when they are considered on the floor.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come here with the true heart of urgency. Our next national election is a little more than 8 months away. We know from public reporting that Russia is back to its 2016 playbook and working to interfere again. What some called a political Pearl Harbor in 2016 is in the process of happening again. It is happening to us again.

I notice that every Member of the Senate has Washington’s Farewell Address, which is an annual which that address is read by Members. It is interesting, in the introduction, that one of the things Washington warned about is interference by foreign powers in the Nation’s domestic affairs: George Washington, President, one of the Founders of our country, wrote back then about the interference of foreign powers in our domestic affairs.

This isn’t about the Kremlin helping Donald Trump, although we know that was their preference the last time. But it has become increasingly clear that at least at this point, chaos is the true goal. We haven’t seen anything that may have changed what their preference was for 4 years. Notice that the President has done should be a reason for them not to want to see him be reelected again. But regardless of whether that is or is not the case, part of this strategy to deny our democracy incapable of standing up to bullies abroad is their goal.

What is this administration’s response? Is it paralysis? No, it is anything but. This administration now appears to be engaged in a proactive strategy to deny this body access to information on this interference. With the appointment of Ric Grenell to serve as Acting Director of National Intelligence, the administration is sending a clear message to the American people, to the Congress, and to governments around the world that our intelligence services are now political commodities to be manipulated and used to gain electoral advantage. Amid all the oversight challenges we face with this administration, we will likely look back on this decision as perhaps one of the most consequential and most damaging to our democratic institutions, and that is saying a lot about this White House.

These reports of Russian interference do not come as a surprise. They should not find us flatfooted. Several of us have introduced sanctions legislation that would deter such Russian behavior from happening. The DASKA in that I introduced with Senator GRAHAM had broad bipartisan support and passed out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with a strong bipartisan vote and is waiting on the Senate floor for action.

What are we waiting for? The election is 8 months away. What are we waiting for? We are waiting for responsible Senators to defend our democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come here with the true heart of urgency. Our next national election is a little more than 8 months away. We know from public reporting that Russia is back to its 2016 playbook and
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 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. Sullivan). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the order for the quorum call being rescinded.

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with messages.

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 this 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—any—limits to radical abortion practices.

I am joined this evening by several of my esteemed 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 together on late-term abortion and ban 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 everyone 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 doctors 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 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 Montana, 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 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 these commonsense measures 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 star athlete, the quarterback 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 an impact. I do not 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 and , 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 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 the swollen ankles I had in the third 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 changes 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-changing facts about 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—whether it is our fathers who 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 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 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? But at that age, this baby 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 the gentleman from Iowa.

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 a second chance to a baby—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 chance in 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 one of 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 horrific 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, 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 just about maybe the doctor 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, until a hospital nurse heard the 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 work together. It’s hard to dispute that there are extreme positions. These 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, 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 protect human life. These 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 pain relievers. This 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. I am proud to be a ‘yes’ vote on both the Born-Alive Bill and the Pain-Capable Child Protection Act, both of which are very important pieces of legislation.

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, 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 soothe them, you want to grab them, you want to hold them, and you want to take away the pain. You would take Tylenol for the pain, if you could, to protect somebody else and the baby. You would 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 them. We want to give comfort to the baby.

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 about the time that babies feel pain, 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 a uterus 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 the patients but to protect both of them 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 would give this 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 can either hear this 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 both of those bills because 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 or the infamous going with us in voting to protect 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. Senator Graham’s bill did not pass in the 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, favored 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.

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 this to happen? 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.

Even if you are unwilling to vote to defend 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. Senator Graham’s bill did not pass in the 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, favored 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.

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 this to happen? 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.
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, most respectfully 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 the pain of being wronged, 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, the math is 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 that is born has a right to live. If you go back a few years ago, 2015, there were 3 Republican 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 ahead of your Senators in States where the sanctity of life—the solemnity of life—is important, get ahead of your Senators and tell them that we need their votes.

I yield 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 Senator Sasse and I co-chaired 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 PROCEEDINGS

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following 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 nomination, the vote on confirmation 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 and that following 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 Geaves nomination, the vote on confirmation occur at 1:45 p.m. on Thursday, February 25. If further cloture 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, today is President’s Day. Ms. Ernst, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the votes on those motions to invoke cloture, the Senate resume legislative session and consider the motion to accommodate the weekly party luncheons; that following the lunch recess, 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 nomination, the vote on confirmation be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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.
It is also a reflection of the Senate’s deep concern about the risk of a broader military conflict between the United States and Iran.

There is no dispute that Soleimani was an enemy of the United States, but this administration has failed to provide any persuasive evidence of such a threat.

Instead, the administration appears to be laying the foundation for further military action against Iran, without coming to Congress. Let’s be clear: It is not just that there is no existing authorization. To the extent that the administration continues to confront Iran militarily, it is doing so in direct opposition to Congress—both the House and Senate—passed bipartisan resolutions directing the President to terminate hostilities with Iran—and without the support of the American people.

With that in mind, I would like to address some of the features of S.J. Res. 68, as well as the administration’s legal rationale for the Soleimani strike and why that rationale is so problematic.

Before doing so, I want to take a step back and make sure that everyone understands the real world impact. Today, over 100 service men and women are suffering from traumatic brain injuries incurred during an Iranian retaliatory attack against Soleimani. My heart goes out to them and their families.

Thankfully there were no American casualties, but we will not be so lucky if President Trump stumbles into a broader conflict with Iran.

So when I raise the alarm over this administration’s actions, it is not academic. It is about our sons and daughters, husbands and wives, and brothers and sisters serving in harm’s way. It is about honoring their service with more than just words. It is about ensuring that they are not needlessly put in danger by an arrogant and lawless administration that refuses to recognize any limitation on its ability to drag our country into war.

S.J. Res. 68 has a number of important features. I will highlight three of them briefly.

First, this resolution established a new precedent in the Senate. The War Powers Resolution, as amended, provides for privileged consideration of joint resolutions that direct the President, in broad terms, to stop the use of U.S. forces in specified hostilities. The only such privileged resolution offered prior to S.J. Res. 68 mandated that the President “remove” U.S. forces from hostilities. The operative language of S.J. Res. 68 uses a variation of that language. Instead of “remove,” it directs the President to “terminate the use of U.S. forces for hostilities.”

In a failed bid to prevent privileged consideration of S.J. Res. 68, the Republican majority asserted, in effect, that “remove from hostilities” was a term of art and that privilege was available only for resolutions that used that specific phrase. That rigid approach is inconsistent with the overarching purpose of the War Powers Resolutions—to reconfirm and reassert its constitutional powers over the use of force—and contrary to the statutory framework and legislative history of the War Powers Resolution. The statute does not prescribe specific terminology. The legislative record is full of examples of the interchangeable use of “remove,” “terminate,” and multiple other synonymous terms.

Ultimately, the Senate moved forward with consideration of S.J. Res. 68 on a privileged and expedited basis. This precedent is noteworthy for two reasons: First, it clarifies that there are no magic words required for privilege. This means that a resolution that references just “stop the use of U.S. Armed Forces in hostilities” will not be deprived of expedited consideration in the Senate over semantics. Second, it provides a degree of flexibility for Senators who seek to stop such haphazard examples “terminate” or other synonyms may be more appropriate than “remove” for certain situations, like cyber operations, where implying a need for or requiring the physical removal of forces may not be practical or appropriate.

Second, S. J. Res. 68 includes a rule of construction stating that it does not prevent the United States from defending itself against imminent attack. This is a critical feature. While we cannot abide by this President or any President usurping Congress’ role and responsibility to authorize the use of force, the United States always has the right to defend itself against an ongoing or imminent attack.

In tandem with this rule of construction, the Senate adopted an amendment offered by Senator Risch that added the following finding: “The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, service members, and diplomats from attack.”

The responsibility to “take actions” in defense of the United States and our people and interests is a core function of the executive branch—diplomacy, law enforcement, intelligence, military force, and beyond. Each type of action is subject to different legal and constitutional considerations, and the President never has a blank check. He or she is obligated to act consistently with both the law and the Constitution at all times, even when in defense of the country. When using military force in self-defense, this does not necessarily mean in response to an attack or imminent attack unless Congress has explicitly authorized some other action. Against this backdrop, the Risch amendment is consistent with both the rule of construction in S.J. Res. 68 and the constitutional balance between Congress and the executive branch over the use of force.

For these reasons, I voted in favor of the Risch amendment and am not surprised it passed overwhelmingly.

While Senate passage of S. J. Res. 68 is a major step against an unnecessary and unauthorized war with Iran, I am concerned that the administration may not heed the message. At minimum, its legal rationale for the Soleimani strike suggests that it is attempting to lay the foundation for further military action against Iran.

The administration has publicly asserted three legal bases for the Soleimani strike, but none of them add up.

First, let me address the 2002 Iraq authorization to use military force, AUMF, a law that this administration has repeatedly contended that it exceeded. The administration has publicly asserted, in effect, that if President Trump stumbles into a retaliatory attack over Soleimani. My heart goes out to our military personnel, but it is about ensuring that such an attack was, in fact, imminent and that the administration may have been acting in self-defense.

Congress passed the 2002 AUMF for a single purpose—to address the threat posed by Saddam Hussein’s alleged weapons of mass destruction. Nothing about the law, its text, or its legislative history suggests that it authorized or was intended to authorize the use of force against Iran.

I know because I was there. I debated the AUMF, and I voted against it. But even the most staunch supporters would never have claimed that the authorization to use force against Saddam Hussein in 2002 extended to the killing of a senior Iranian commander 18 years later.

The administration also cites article II of the Constitution as a legal basis for the Soleimani strike. Article II would be available to the extent the strike was necessary to defend against an imminent attack; however, as I noted earlier, nearly 2 months have passed, and Congress and the American people are still waiting for proof—proof that such an attack was, in fact, imminent and, if so, that killing Soleimani was required to prevent the attack.

Perhaps not surprisingly, given the lack of support for this strike, the administration does not limit its article II claim to self-defense. Like other recent administrations, it asserts that the Constitution empowers the President to use military force “to protect important national interests.”

But what kind of legal standard is this? At best, “protecting important national interests” sets an incredibly low bar for the most consequential of actions. At worst, it is a self-serving power grab that the President can use to justify military action anywhere in the world without congressional authorization.
We should not be surprised—this “standard” was concocted by and for the executive branch to maximize the President’s ability to use military force without congressional authorization. It does not reflect a neutral analysis of the separation of power. It has not been tested in the courts and it has not been approved by Congress.

Just a few weeks ago, in this very Chamber, we listened as the President’s defense lawyers argued during the impeachment trial that steps taken in support of the President’s reelection are in the national interest. That was a shocking and frightening claim in the impeachment context. But now consider it in the context of sending the men and women of our Armed Forces into harm’s way.

Surely the Constitution does not authorize the President to use force in support of his or her reelection. Surely, it does not. Then again, this administration has been unable or unwilling to identify any limits on its purported Article II authority, any instance in which it needs Congress to authorize the use of force.

Finally, I refer you to Secretary Pompeo’s January 17, 2020, appearance on the Hugh Hewitt radio show. While on air, Secretary Pompeo insinuated that the designation of the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization, FTO, serves as a legal basis to target IRGC members, presumably including Soleimani.

FTO designations are administrative actions taken pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; they are clearly not congressional authorizations for the use of military force.

Now, I was hoping that Secretary Pompeo himself or a State Department official on his behalf would issue a simple clarification and acknowledge what we all know: An FTO designation has clearly not congressional authorization for the use of military force.

I have written the Secretary on this question, and I have posed the same question to the State Department’s Acting Legal Adviser. We continue to await a response, and I must say that the delay does not leave me with much confidence that we will receive the right answer.

As so clearly demonstrated by the flimsy legal rationale advanced in relation to the Soleimani strike, we cannot rely on this administration or any administration to guard Congress’ prerogative powers.

I am hopeful that the Soleimani strike and the Senate debate over S.J. Res. 68 will serve as a wake-up call. I am hopeful that all of our colleagues in this Chamber and in the House will work to reassert Congress’ role over the use of foreign forces.

We owe it to the Constitution, we owe it to the American people, and we owe it to the men and women who fight and die on our behalf.

**VOTE EXPLANATION**

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was absent for vote No. 300 on the Nomination. Confirmation: Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. Had I been present, I would have voted no on the nomination.

Mr. President, I was absent for vote No. 339 on the Amendment S. Amdt. 1209: Lee Amdt. No. 2109; To prohibit the expenditure of certain amounts from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for land acquisition. Had I been present, I would have voted no on the amendment.

**RECOGNIZING 175 YEARS OF HOSPITALITY IN FRENCH LICK**

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to recognize 175 years of tourism, history, and hospitality that the French Lick Resort has brought to my home State of Indiana.

In 1832, two Hoosier brothers, Thomas and Dr. William Bowles, purchased 1,500 acres of property near French Lick, IN. Part of the property’s allure was the mineral springs loaded with Epsom salt and sulfur. As a physician, Dr. Bowles became intrigued by the medicinal benefits that the mineral springs possessed, which famously turned into the Hoosier tonic Pluto Whiskey. In 1846, the brothers welcomed their first guests after building a unique, three-story, wood-framed hotel.

In 1901, a small group of investors, including former Indianapolis mayor Tom Taggart, bought the property from the Bowles brothers. Mayor Taggart’s vision and political expertise aided in the development of the hotel and the expansion of the Monon Railroad from Chicago to the front entrance. Tourists were encouraged to “take to the waters.” By 1965, the French Link Springs Hotel had become a grand destination, and its services were greatly sought after by all of Indiana society. Soon enough, it had gained worldwide recognition. With the hotel’s stunning success, Donald James Ross, “the Michelangelo of golf course design” and a member of the World Golf Hall of Fame, was hired to build the French Lick Springs Golf Course. In 1924, the course hosted a PGA championship, attracting more national attention and further success. By 1991, the hotel became the unofficial headquarters of the national Democratic Party and became the site for the 1981 Democratic Governor’s Conference. As a socialite destination, numerous notable guests visited the springs, including Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Ronald Reagan, John Barrymore, and Howard Hughes.

Because of its heritage of tourism and hospitality, in 2000 the French Lick Springs Hotel was added to the National Register of Historic Places—a distinction of notable merit. In 2005, the French Lick Springs Hotel and its former competitor, the West Baden Springs Hotel, were purchased by the Cook Group, Inc., a family-owned company headquartered in Bloomington, IN. After a complete 1-year renovation, the French Lick Resort was born, continuing its legacy of attracting visitors from around the world.

The French Lick Resort and its world-class amenities have served millions of guests and has greatly added to the cultural history of the United States. On behalf of the State of Indiana, I wish the resort continued success for another 175 years and beyond.

**TRIBUTE TO BETTY COLBERT**

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Ms. Betty Colbert on the occasion of her retirement from her position as program assistant for the U.S. Senate Youth Program, USSYP, after 57 years of remarkable service.

Ms. Colbert started working for the USSYP during its first program in 1963 and has continued her impressive tenure ever since. With her guidance, the program has provided unparalleled educational opportunities and experiences for countless high school students.

Her involvement with the program started thanks to her late husband, Mr. George Colbert, a Tuskegee airman who served as Mr. Randy Hearst’s driver while Mr. Hearst was helping to develop the USSYP. Despite working full time with the National Institutes of Health, Ms. Colbert took leave each year in order to devote herself to the USSYP’s administration. A thoughtful, giving woman, she took a hands-on approach, doing everything from taking calls from Senate offices and the White House to making sure each participating student got an individual flag flown over the Capitol to recognize their accomplishments.

The success of USSYP alumni is in part thanks to Ms. Colbert’s tireless efforts. I participate in the program every year, including serving as co-chair in 2019, and I can attest firsthand to her unfailing work ethic and the level of care she puts in to every aspect of the USSYP.

Students, Senators, and staff members have all bore witness to Ms. Colbert’s extraordinary commitment to her role. Not only does she ensure everything runs smoothly for all involved, but she also focuses on the small details. Her driven, considerate nature plays a significant part in giving students the most enjoyable and transformative experience possible. Ms. Colbert leaves behind a legacy that will continue to positively shape the USSYP for years to come.

I applaud her over half a century of service and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Ms. Betty Colbert on her well-earned retirement.
TRIBUTE TO TROY WAYMAN

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the CEO and president of One Acadiana, 1A, Troy Wayman, and the entire 1A organization for the distinguished honor of becoming an accredited economic development organization, AEDO. 1A has joined the ranks of only 66 economic groups in the world to earn the AEDO standing.

In 2015, the Greater Lafayette Chamber of Commerce’s board of directors ventured out to create an organization that would embody its longstanding mission—to be the leading force in the improvement of the business environment as well as the economic health and development of the region. Over the last 5 years, 1A has grown to more than 800 investors, members, and partners while serving the 9-parish Acadiana region. In a year’s process, 1A was recognized and was awarded as an AEDO, cementing its place among the best of the best in the industry.

Being honored and recognized by the International Economic Development Council, IEDC, as an AEDO speaks volumes to who they are as an organization. The dedication and passion that drives these members is a testament to their organization and speaks volumes to all of Louisiana. Congratulations. One Acadiana, on becoming an AEDO. I look forward to witnessing what the future holds for 1A and the entire Acadiana region.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM GASTON CAPERTON III

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, it is a great privilege of mine to rise and honor the legacy of one of the most influential, generous, and inspiring Western Virginians I have ever had the pleasure of calling a dear friend: William Gaston Caperton III. My friend Gaston turns 80 years young on February 21, 2020, and I look forward to witnessing what the future holds for 1A and the entire Acadiana region.

Mr. Speaker. Mr. President, it is with pride I rise to recognize an outstanding public servant from my home State of West Virginia. Through his tireless efforts, he has inspired today’s generation of leaders, and will continue to inspire generations to come.

Gaston was elected as the 31st governor of West Virginia in 1996 and quickly revolutionized West Virginia’s education system. During the 8 years of his administration, the average teacher salary went from 49th in the Nation to 31st. He launched one of the country’s earliest and most comprehensive basic skills computer initiatives, as well as invested more than $800 million into building, modernizing, and improving school facilities throughout the State.

Gaston’s leadership also renewed the opportunity for all Americans. During his 13 years of leadership, the College Board launched the PSAT, which is now the SAT, and doubled the number of students taking the SAT. Gaston also increased the number of students succeeding in Advanced Placement, adding a writing section to the SAT.

Gaston’s leadership also renewed the organization’s focus on education in a mission-driven, student-first operation promoting college success and opportunity for all Americans. During his 13 years of leadership, the College Board increased the number of high schools and colleges promoting the importance of writing by adding a writing section to the SAT. and doubled the number of students succeeding in Advanced Placement. Gaston’s leadership also renewed the organization’s focus on education in a mission-driven, student-first operation promoting college success and opportunity for all Americans.

During his more than 20 years in government and education, Gaston chaired the Democratic Governor’s Association and the Southern Regional Education Board, participated in the executive committee of the National Governors Association, received 10 honorary doctoral degrees, and has been presented with numerous awards, including the 1996 Computerworld Smithsonian Award for his tireless efforts to introduce technology into the classroom. He was also awarded the 2007 James S. Goodnight Comptroller Award for his significant contributions to the quality of education in the United States and the 2012 Policy Maker of the Year by the National Association of School Boards of Education.

After retiring from the College Board in 2012, Gaston moved back to his hometown and served on the board of directors of a variety of U.S. corporations. He has two sons, Gat and John, and is the proud grandfather of Eliza, Katie, Evie, Ella, and Genavielle.

I can’t speak enough to what a good-hearted, wonderful person he truly is. I always think of Gaston as a Renaissance man, no matter the circumstances, he kept a cool head and a warm demeanor, always able to discern the most honorole path forward. He has always been one of West Virginia’s most proud representatives, no matter where life has taken him. Again, it is a privilege to join the people of the Mountain State in celebrating Gaston Caperton’s life and legacy and to wish him a very happy 80th birthday.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(These messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the Secretary of the Senate, on February 14, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 375. An act to improve efforts to identify and reduce Governmentwide improper payments, and for other purposes.
S. 384. An act to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions.
S. 397. An act to increase the number of CBP Agriculture Specialists and support staff in the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes.
S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of John Fahey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.
S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Risa Lavizzo-Mourey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.
H.R. 501. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes.
H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution approving the request of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a waiver under section 1703(f) of title 38, United States Code.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions were signed on February 20, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BOOZ-MAN).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 20, 2020, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 375. An act to improve efforts to identify and reduce Governmentwide improper payments, and for other purposes.

S. 394. An act to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions.

S. 2107. An act to increase the number of CBP Agriculture Specialists and support personnel.

S. 1636. An act to designate as a national monument the Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions.

S. 1637. An act to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions.

S. 1638. An act to designate as a national monument the Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4002. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2021”; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans’ Affairs.

EC–4004. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for the Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Federal Agency Drug-Free Workplace Program”; to the Appropriations; and Armed Services.

EC–4005. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) for two Army programs as of September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–4006. A communication from the Management Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “2020 Annual Report of C - Conveyance of Small Tracts” (RIN0596-AD40) received in the Office of the President on February 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4007. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of the Governor, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Mali Sanctions Regulations” (31 CFR Part 556) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4008. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4009. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4010. A communication from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Regulations and Legislation, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Single-Family Condominiums” (RIN2502-AJ42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4011. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4012. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Washington; Revised Public Notice Provisions and other Modifications” (RIN 0585–18–Stated Region 10) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4013. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Air Quality Standards” (RIN 0585–16–Region 3) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4014. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Washington; Revised Public Notice Provisions and other Modifications” (RIN 0585–18–Stated Region 10) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4015. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Air Quality Standards” (RIN 0585–16–Region 3) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4016. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; 2019 Amendments to Virginia’s Ambient Air Quality Standards” (RIN 0586-AD94) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4017. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Salt Lake County, Utah County, and Ogden City PM 10 Redesignation to attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Standards and State Implementation Plan Revisions” (FRL No. 10004–94–Region 8) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4018. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Salt Lake County, Utah County, and Ogden City PM 10 Redesignation to attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Standards and State Implementation Plan Revisions” (FRL No. 10004–94–Region 8) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4019. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Georgia; Final Approval and Incorporation of Air Quality Standards and Air Quality Standards and State Implementation Plan Revisions” (FRL No. 10004–27–Region 4) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4020. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Stationary Combustion Turbine Residual Risk and Technology Review” (FRL No. 10005–14–OAR) received in the Office of the President on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4021. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Significant New Use Rules on Certain
Chemical Substances (18–1); Technical Correc-
tion” (FRL No. 10035–04–SCPP) received in the
Office of the President of the Senate on February
12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and
Public Works.
EC–4022. A communication from the Direc-
tor of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Divi-
sion, Office of Border Protection, Department of
Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law,
the report of a rule enti-
titled “Import Restrictions Imposed on Ar-
chaeological and Ethnological Material from
Ecuador” (RIN1535–A529) received in the Of-
lice of the President of the Senate on Feb-
ruary 12, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.
EC–4023. A communication from the Assistant
Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of
State, transmitting, pursuant to section 56(c) of the
Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a
proposed license amendment for the export of defense arti-
cles, including technical data and defense services,
to France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the UK to sup-
port the manufacture, production, test, inspec-
tion, modification, enhancement, rework, and
repair of the Trailing Edge Flap Bonded in the F/A–18D
aircraft in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal
No. DDTC 19–059); to the Com-
mittee on Foreign Relations.
EC–4024. A communication from the Assist-
ant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Depart-
ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 56(c) of the
Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a
proposed license amendment for the export of defense arti-
cles, including technical data and defense services,
to Japan to support the manufac-
ture of 2.75-inch rockets and subcomponents, including MK66 rocket motors, M261/M267
submunition warheads, M131 warheads, M274
practice warheads, and WTU-1/B practice war-
head fuzes in the amount of $100,000,000 or
more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19–068); to the Com-
mittee on Foreign Relations.
EC–4025. A communication from the Assist-
ant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Depart-
ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 56(c) of the
Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a
proposed license amendment for the export of defense arti-
cles, including technical data and defense services,
to the Republic of Korea to support the manufac-
ture of 240mm artillery commer-
citable cartridge cases, 60mm and 81mm mor-
tar increment containers, and 120mm tank
combustible cartridge cases in the amount of
$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal
No. DDTC 19–069); to the Committee on Foreign Rela-
tions.
EC–4026. A communication from the Assist-
ant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Depart-
ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 56(c) of the
Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense arti-
cles, including technical data and defense services,
to Israel and the Netherlands, to support the
manufacture, production, test, and support
services for composite materials, subassemblies, and metallic components for the
F–35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) aircraft
center fuselage in the amount of $100,000,000 or
more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19–063); to the
Committee on Foreign Relations.
EC–4027. A communication from the In-
spector General’s Congressional Budget Jus-
tification for fiscal year 2021; to the Com-
mittee on Health, Education, Labor, and
Pensions.
EC–4028. A communication from the Dep-
uty Assistant General Counsel for Regu-
lation, Affirmative Action, Pension Benefit Guaranty
Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Miscellaneous
Corrections, Clarifications, and Improve-
ments” (RIN1212–AB34) received in the Office
of the President of the Senate on February
13, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Edu-
cation, Labor, and Pensions.
EC–4029. A communication from the Regu-
lations Coordinator, Division of Global Mi-
gration and Quarantine, Centers for Disease
Control and Prevention, transmitting, pursu-
ant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Control of Communicable Diseases; Foreign Quarantine” (RIN0929–AA75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on Fe-
bruary 13, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
EC–4030. A communication from the Assist-
ant General Counsel for General Law, De-
partment of Homeland Security, transmitting,
pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland
Security, received in the Office of the Presi-
dent of the Senate on February 13, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and
Governmental Affairs.
EC–4031. A communication from the Acting
Chief Financial Officer, Department of
Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to
law, the Annual Performance Plan for fis-
ca
l ye
ar yea
rs
2019–2021; to the
Committee on Homeland Security and Gov-
ernmental Affairs.
EC–4032. A communication from the Attorney
General, Department of Justice, trans-
mitt
in
g, pursuant to law, a report relative to a
vacancy in the position of Administrator,
Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA),
Department of Justice, received in the Office
of the President of the Senate on February
12, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
EC–4033. A communication from the Acting
Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of
Competition, Federal Trade Commission, trans-
mitt
in
g, pursuant to law, the report of
rule entitled “Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 7A of the Clayton Act”; received in the Office of the
President of the Senate on February 13, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
EC–4034. A communication from the Sec-
retary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting,
pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans
Affairs Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2019; to the
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
The following bills and joint resolu-
tions were introduced, read the first
and second times by unanimous con-
sent, and referred as indicated:
By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr.
Sasse):
S. 3323. A bill to amend the Federal Credit
Union Act to modernize certain processes re-
garding federal credit unions, prohibit
insider transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.
By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr.
BRAUN):
S. 3324. A bill to permit the Miami Nation
of Indians to apply for acknowledgement as
a federal recognized Indian tribe, and for
other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr.
MENENDEZ, and Mr. CARDIN):
S. 3325. A bill to amend part D of title IV of
the Social Security Act to allow States to
use incentive payments available under the child support enforcement program to
improve parent-child relationships, increase
child support collections, and improve out-
comes for children by supporting parenting
time agreements for noncustodial parents in
uncontested agreements, and for other pur-
poses; to the Committee on Finance.
By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr.
Burk):
S. 3326. A bill to amend the Federal Credit
Union Act to remove outdated responsibil-
ties of boards of directors of Federal credit
unions; to the Committee on Banking, Hous-
ing, and Urban Affairs.
By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr.
Cruz):
S. 3327. A bill to require the imposition of
sanctions with respect to officials of the
Government of Lebanon responsible for the
deliberate theft and misappropriation of
citizens and nationals of the United States held
in Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Rela-
tions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS
S. 436. At the request of Mr. Van Hollen, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) was added as a cosponsor of S. 436, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the development of public transportation operations safety risk reduction pro-
grams, and for other purposes.
S. 490. At the request of Mr. Warner, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Cassidy) was added as a cosponsor of S. 490, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided edu-
cation assistance to employer pay-
ments of student loans.
S. 476. At the request of Mr. Wyden, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) was added as a co-
sponsor of S. 476, a bill to amend title XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide greater transparency of
discounts provided by drug manufac-
turers.
S. 505. At the request of Ms. Duckworth, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. Cantwell) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful de-
tention based solely on a protected characteristic.
S. 514. At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Depart-
ment of Veterans Affairs to veterans and their families.
S. 695. At the request of Mr. Merkley, the name of the Senator from Delaware...
(Mr. BENTEN) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 696, a bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as co-sponsors of S. 815, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 1238

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRADBURY) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1238, a bill to provide requirements for Executive agency spending at the end of a fiscal year, and for other purposes.

S. 1352

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1352, a bill to establish a Federal Advisory Council to Support Victims of Gun Violence.

S. 1399

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1399, a bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Services Act to revise and extend nursing workforce development programs.

S. 1719

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1719, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to create an Executive agency spending arrangements for childcare services for military families.

S. 1922

At the request of Mr. KAIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1922, a bill to provide a work opportunity tax credit for military spouses and to provide for flexible spending arrangements for childcare services for military families.

S. 2061

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2061, a bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD–VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

S. 2254

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. U'DALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2254, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Negro Leagues baseball.

S. 2373

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2373, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve obstetric care in rural areas.

S. 2548

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2548, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 2570

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2570, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Greg LeMond in recognition of his service to the United States as an athlete, activist, role model, and community leader.

S. 2579

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2579, a bill to facilitate the automatic acquisition of citizenship for lawful permanent resident children of military and Federal Government personnel residing abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 2705

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2705, a bill to amend title III, United States Code, to modify the requirements relating to the use of construction authority in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 2715

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2715, a bill to develop and implement policies to advance early childhood development, to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2730

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2733, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 2933

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2999, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 2999

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2999, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 2999

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2999, a bill to amend part A of title XI of the Social Security Act to establish an interagency council on social determinants of health, and for other purposes.

S. 2999

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2999, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements.

S. 3023

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 3023, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements.

S. 3023

At the request of Ms. BERNSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 2970, a bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protective equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2970

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protective equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2970

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2715, a bill to develop and implement policies to advance early childhood development, to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2715

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2733, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 2733

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2999, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 2999

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2999, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 2999

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2999, a bill to amend part A of title XI of the Social Security Act to establish an interagency council on social determinants of health, and for other purposes.

S. 2999

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2999, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements.

S. 3023

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 3023, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements. 
At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3020, supra.

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3023, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institutes of Health to make awards to outstanding scientists, including physician-scientists, to support researchers focusing on pediatric research, including basic, clinical, translational, or pediatric pharmaceutical research, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3095, a bill to develop voluntary guidelines for accessible postsecondary electronic instructional materials and related technologies, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3144, a bill to establish a competitive grant program to support out-of-school-time youth workforce readiness programs, providing employability skills development, career exploration, employment readiness training, mentoring, work-based learning, and workforce opportunities for eligible youth.

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3154, a bill to improve the effectiveness of tribal child support enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 3217, a bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3249, a bill to amend the FAST Act to modify a provision relating to the Motorcyclist Advisory Council.

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3263, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to reduce the production and use of certain single-use plastic products and packaging, to improve the responsibility of producers in the design, collection, reuse, recycling, and disposal of their consumer products and packaging, to prevent pollution from consumer products and packaging from entering into animal and human food chains and waterways, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3267, a bill to provide adequate information about excessive Federal spending, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3286, a bill to restrict certain Federal grants for States that grant driver licenses to illegal immigrants and fail to share information about criminal aliens with the Federal Government.

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3299, a bill to repeal certain impediments to the administration of the firearms laws.

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3319, a bill to reauthorize comprehensive research and statistical review and analysis of trafficking in persons and commercial sex acts, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 5, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 35, a concurrent resolution providing for a joint hearing of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the audited financial statement of the executive branch.

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 481, a resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 502, a resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Henning Schulzrinne, Nancy Kusmaul, Luis River, and Nicholas Wondra be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

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

COMMEMORATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF THE AUSCHWITZ EXTERMINATION CAMP IN NAZI-OCCUPIED POLAND

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 481.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 481) commemorating the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?
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Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to, that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 481) was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of January 21, 2020, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:32 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 25, 2019, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:
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The resolution (S. Res. 481) was agreed to.
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ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.
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### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

**FEBRUARY 26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Veterans' Affairs</td>
<td>To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations. SD-G50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources</td>
<td>To hold hearings to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations. SD-G50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARCH 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs</td>
<td>To hold hearings to examine resources and authorities needed to protect and secure the homeland. SD-342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Indian Affairs</td>
<td>To hold hearings to examine S. 2610, to reauthorize certain programs under the Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs of the Department of Energy, and S. 2891, to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish Tribal Wildlife Corridors. SD-628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARCH 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Armed Services Subcommission on SeaPower</td>
<td>To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program. SR-222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Subcommission on Water and Power</td>
<td>To hold hearings to examine the impact of invasive species on Bureau of Reclamation facilities and management of water resources in the West. SD-366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARCH 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Armed Services</td>
<td>To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program. SD-G50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs</td>
<td>To hold hearings to examine threats posed by state-owned and state-supported enterprises to public transportation. SD-538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources</td>
<td>To hold hearings to examine the latest developments and longer-term prospects for global energy markets, with a special focus on the United States, from the perspective of the International Energy Agency. SD-366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARCH 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs</td>
<td>To hold hearings to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s semi-annual report to Congress. SD-538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARCH 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Veterans' Affairs</td>
<td>To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. SD-G50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARCH 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs</td>
<td>To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. SD-538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.*

Matter set in **this typeface** indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
HIGHLIGHTS

Senator Baldwin delivered Washington’s Farewell Address.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1091–S1121

Measures Introduced: Five bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3323–3327.

Measures Passed:

Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act: Senate passed S. 995, to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Liberation of Auschwitz 75th Anniversary: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 481, commemorating the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Molloy Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action: By 88 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. EX. 53), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Tuesday, February 25, 2020.

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, at 11:30 a.m., on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, and the motion to invoke cloture on the of nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior; provided further that if cloture is invoked on the nominations, and following the third vote in the series, Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. to accommodate the week party lunches; at 2:15 p.m., Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3275, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and the time from 2:15 p.m. until 3:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two Leaders or their designees; provided further that at 3:30 p.m., cloture on the motions to proceed to consideration of S. 3275, and S. 311, 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, ripen, and that following the votes on the motions to invoke cloture, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, confirmation of the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, and cloture on the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court; if cloture is invoked on the nomination of Travis Greaves, the vote on confirmation of the nomination occur at 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, February 27, 2020.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.
41 Army nominations in the rank of general.
16 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.
14 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Messages from the House:

Pages S1116–S1121
Enrolled Bills Presented: Page S1117
Executive Communications: Pages S1117–18
Additional Cosponsors: Pages S1118–20
Additional Statements: Page S1116
Privileges of the Floor: Page S1120
Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—53) Page S1106

Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 7:52 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, February 25, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1121.)

Committee Meetings
(Committees not listed did not meet)
No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 25, 2020.

Committee Meetings
No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings
No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2020
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD–138.
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Health and Human Services, 10:30 a.m., SD–124.


Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on public transportation stakeholders' perspectives, 10 a.m., SD–538.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2021 for the Forest Service, 10 a.m., SD–366.
Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy, to hold hearings to examine North Korea policy one year after Hanoi, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.
Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine rule by district judge, focusing on the challenges of universal injunctions, 10 a.m., SD–226.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans, 2 p.m., SD–G50.
Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House
No hearings are scheduled.

Joint Meetings
Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans, 2 p.m., SD–G50.
Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine improving family stability for the wellbeing of American children, 2:15 p.m., SD–106.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD
Week of February 25 through February 28, 2020

Senate Chamber
On Tuesday, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, to be
Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 11:30 a.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, Senate will vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, and Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

At 3:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3275, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 311, 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, followed by votes on the confirmation of the nominations of Silvia Carreno-Coll and Katharine MacGregor, and on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: February 25, Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD–138.

February 25, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Health and Human Services, 10:30 a.m., SD–124.


Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: February 25, to hold hearings to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on public transportation stakeholders’ perspectives, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: February 25, to hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2021 for the Forest Service, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: February 25, Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy, to hold hearings to examine North Korea policy one year after Hanoi, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: February 25, to hold hearings to examine rule by district judge, focusing on the challenges of universal injunctions, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: February 25, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

February 26, Full Committee, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

Select Committee on Intelligence: February 25, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, February 26, Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, hearing entitled “Innovative Wood Products: Promoting Rural Economies and Healthy Forests”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, February 26, Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, to hear the budget hearing on the Department of Health and Human Services, 9:30 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.


February 26, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, budget hearing on the Judiciary Department, 2 p.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

February 26, Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 2:30 p.m., 2008 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security, budget hearing on the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 9:30 a.m., 2008 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Education, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Transportation, 10:30 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General”, 11 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing entitled “U.S. European Command (EUCOM)”, 11 a.m., H–140 Capitol. This hearing is closed.

February 27, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the U.S. Forest Service, 1 p.m., 2008 Rayburn.
February 27, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Library of Congress, 1 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Oversight of VA’s Electronic Health Record Modernization Implementation”, 1 p.m., 2358-C Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Energy Budget, 2 p.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Government Accountability Office, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, hearing entitled “Members Day”, 2 p.m., HT–2 Capitol.

February 27, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing entitled “World-Wide Threat”, 3 p.m., H–405 Capitol. This hearing is closed.


Committee on the Budget, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Budget Priorities: Members’ Day”, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Labor, February 26, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled “Asleep at the Switch: How the Department of Labor Failed to Oversee the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund”, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment, hearing entitled “Reauthorizing the National Apprenticeship Act: Strengthening and Growing Apprenticeships for the 21st century”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.


February 26, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “The Fiscal Year 2021 HHS Budget and Oversight of the Coronavirus Outbreak”, 1:30 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, hearing entitled “The Fiscal Year 2021 EPA Budget”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled “Strengthening Communications Networks to Help Americans in Crisis”, 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, February 27, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 149, the “Housing Fairness Act of 2020”; H.R. 4531, the “Yes In My Backyard Act”; H.R. 5187, the “Housing Is Infrastructure Act”; H.R. 5929, the “Shareholder Political Transparency Act”; H.R. 5930, the “Workforce Investment Disclosure Act”; H.R. 5931, the “Improving FHA Support for Small Dollar Mortgages Act of 2020”; and H.R. 5932, the “Ensuring Chinese Debt Transparency Act”, 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 27, Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation, hearing entitled “Coronavirus Disease 2019: The U.S. and International Response”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

February 28, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Evaluating the Trump Administration’s Policies on Iran, Iraq and the Use of Force”, 8:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, February 26, Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism, hearing entitled “Confronting the Rise in Anti-Semitic Domestic Terrorism, Part II”, 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

February 27, Subcommittee on Border Security, Facilitation, and Operations, hearing entitled “Examining the Effect of the Border Wall on Private and Tribal Landowners”, 11 a.m., 310 Cannon.

February 27, Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability, hearing entitled “Building a Diverse and Inclusive Workforce to Meet the Homeland Security Mission”, 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, February 26, Full Committee, markup on legislation on the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020; H.R. 2733, the “Savanna’s Act”; H.R. 2438, the “Not Invisible Act of 2019”; and legislation on the Strengthening the Opposition to Female Genital Mutilation Act, 2:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing entitled “Returning Citizens: Challenges and Opportunities for Reentry”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.


Committee on Natural Resources, February 26, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 5435, the “American Public Lands and Waters Climate Solution Act of 2019”; and H.R. 5859, the “Trillion Trees Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.


February 27, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, hearing on H.R. 3651, to facilitate the use of certain lands in Nebraska for public outdoor recreational opportunities, and for other purposes; H.R. 3681, the “Green Spaces, Green Vehicles Act of 2019”; H.R. 4236, the “Reducing Waste in National Parks Act”; and H.R. 4512, the “Outdoors for All Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

February 27, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Sexual Harassment at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, February 26, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Voter Suppression in Minority Communities: Learning from the Past to Protect Our Future”, 11 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.
February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Administration’s Religious Liberty Assault on LGBT Rights”, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.


Committee on Rules, February 26, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2339, the “Reversing the Youth Tobacco Epidemic Act of 2019” [Protecting American Lungs and Reversing the Youth Tobacco Epidemic Act of 2020], 4 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “A Review of the Administration’s Federal Research and Development Budget Proposal for Fiscal Year 2021”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Oversight; and Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, joint hearing entitled “An Examination of Federal Flood Maps in a Changing Climate”, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, February 26, Full Committee, hearing entitled “A Discussion with SBA Administrator Jovita Carranza: Current Issues and the FY2021 Budget”, 11:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Contracting and Infrastructure, hearing entitled “Moving America’s Infrastructure Forward”, 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, February 26, Full Committee, markup on amending Committee rules; approving revised membership and leadership of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management; Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Views and Estimates of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; H. Con. Res. 90, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; H.R. 4470, to rename the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; H.R. 5756, the “Resiliency Enhancement Act of 2020”; H.R. 2914, the “Housing Survivors of Major Disasters Act of 2019”; H.R. 5912, the “ Expedited Delivery of Airport Infrastructure Act of 2020”; legislation on the Preventing Disaster Revictimization Act; and General Service Administration’s Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing entitled “Proposals for a Water Resources Development Act of 2020: Members’ Day Hearing”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2021”, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Ways and Means, February 26, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S.-China Trade and Competition”, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Proposed Fiscal Year 2021 Budget With Health and Human Services Secretary Azar”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: February 25, to hold hearings to examine improving family stability for the wellbeing of American children, 2:15 p.m., SD–106.

Joint Hearing: February 25, Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

February 26, Full Committee, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 2 p.m., SD–G50.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Tuesday, February 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands. At 11:30 a.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, to be followed by votes on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, and the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

At 3:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3275, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 311, 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. To be followed by votes on the confirmation of the nominations of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, and the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court.

(Senate will recess following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2 p.m., Tuesday, February 25

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.