(Ms. Klobuchar), 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?

The result was announced—yeas 52, navs 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Ex.]

YEAS-52

Alexander Barrasso Blackburn Blunt Boozman Braun Burr Capito Cassidy Collins Cornyn Cotton Cramer Crapo Daines Enzi Ernst	Gardner Graham Grassley Hawley Hoeven Hyde-Smith Inhofe Johnson Jones Kennedy Lankford Lee Loeffler Manchin McConnell McSally Murkowski	Portman Risch Roberts Romney Rounds Rubio Sasse Scott (SC) Shelby Sinema Sullivan Thune Tillis Toomey Wicker Young
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS-40

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

NOT VOTING-8

Cantwell	Moran	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Perdue	Warren
Klobuchar	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Danly nomination, 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last week, Congress provided billions in funding to address the coronavirus outbreak. These funds will help support virus research, testing, and medical care. Congress is now looking at other

measures that may be required, including measures to address the economic impact of the virus. The House may consider an economic response measure today, but my understanding is that its bill does not yet reflect an agreement with the White House, which will be needed to move any stimulus package.

I want to echo the leader's comments from yesterday and say that this is not a time for partisanship, and it is very important that we work together on matters related to the coronavirus so that we can get needed legislation passed in a timely fashion.

More Americans are testing positive for the virus each day—including eight people in my home State of South Dakota—and it is our responsibility as Members of Congress to work together to ensure that our country has the resources it needs to combat and defeat this disease.

There is no doubt that things are stressful right now. Americans are understandably worried about their own health and the health of their loved ones. But we have a lot of dedicated people working to keep Americans safe, from nurses and doctors to public health officials. Everyone is focused on making sure we do what we need to do to limit the spread of this virus. And all of us, of course, can help in that effort by paying attention to the guidance we are given, whether it is advice about washing our hands or avoiding large gatherings or a request to stay home for a while.

It is a challenging time, but America has been through challenging times before and emerged from them stronger. I am confident that if we pull together, that is what will happen again.

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

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

$\begin{array}{c} {\tt NATIONAL} \ {\tt WOMEN'S} \ {\tt HISTORY} \\ {\tt MONTH} \end{array}$

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this Women's History Month, we have the opportunity to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment of the Constitution, which gave women the right to vote.

We recognize the countless women who have put their own safety and comfort on the line in order to make this country more just, democratic, and inclusive. These include heroes like Margaret Brent, a daughter of Maryland who was the first to demand a vote for women in the colonial legislature, and Sojourner Truth, who advocated for a more diverse and intersectional women's suffrage movement. Thanks to their bravery and that of many other activists, our Nation wit-

nessed the largest expansion of suffrage in its history.

A century later, we ought to celebrate that monumental achievement. The ability to vote has empowered women to demand a government that represents them and their interests, and they have taken their power seriously. Women have voted in higher numbers than men in every national election for the last 55 years. In 2018, we saw the results that can happen when women raise their voices and fight for a more inclusive democracy as a record 117 women won elections to Congress across the United States.

We cannot overstate how dramatically the adoption of the 19th Amendment has changed our country for the better, but it is also incumbent upon us to take stock of the progress that still needs to be made.

Just a few years after women won the right to vote, a suffragette named Alice Paul introduced another critically important constitutional amendment, one that would go even further in guaranteeing the equal status of women. It was called the Equal Rights Amendment, or the ERA, which reads as follows: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." That is it. It is just 24 words. Yet those 24 words have the power to correct a 250-year silence in our Constitution when it comes to recognizing and protecting women's equality.

The ERA was ratified by the U.S. Congress in 1972, and with Virginia's ratification this past January, enough States have adopted the amendment to meet the threshold for it to be added to the Constitution. So what is the holdup? Why isn't it a part of the Constitution yet? When Congress ratified the Equal Rights Amendment, it imposed a deadline for State legislatures to ratify. That deadline has passed.

There should never be a deadline on equality. The Constitution does not call for time limits for the ratification of amendments, and there is precedent for amendments being added to the Constitution as many as 200 years after having first been proposed.

Most importantly, just as Congress had the power to impose and extend the deadline by resolution, we have the power to remove it through the same means. That is why I have introduced a resolution with Senator Murkowski to remove the ratification deadline for the Equal Rights Amendment. Representative Jackie Speier introduced a companion resolution that has already been passed by the House of Representatives. We are closer than ever to making the Equal Rights Amendment a reality.

This measure has historically enjoyed bipartisan support. The vast majority of Americans—94 percent of them—is in favor of a constitutional equality amendment. Perhaps it is because they understand that this is an issue not of politics but of basic human