making it even harder to undo centuries of harm unleashed by systemic racism and economic injustice, systems under which women of color have suffered the most. Look, I know that a lot of us are tired from the seemingly endless fight to protect our most basic human rights, but we can do more. We have to do more. We must.

Congress itself has the power. We have the ability to vote tomorrow to pass the Women's Health Protection Act, which would codify Roe v. Wade once and for all because, let me be clear, women seeking care should not be ashamed. The people who should feel shame are those forcing these women to live through unnecessary pain and suffering. The people who should feel shame are those who claim to be pro-life, yet would let a mother die in childbirth for an unviable pregnancy, who refuse to expand Medicaid, who believe guns should be easy to get but basic healthcare impossible to find. These are the people who should be ashamed. These are the people who have no shame. And I will be damned if I let my daughters grow up in a country that gives them fewer rights than their mom had.

So here I am today fighting for tomorrow that doesn't look like our yesterday because in that yesterday, those of us with uteruses were treated as second-class citizens. And I didn't learn to fly Black Hawk helicopters, go to war for this Nation, nearly lose my life fighting for the rights enshrined in that Constitution I protected, only to come back home and have those same rights stripped away from the next generation of girls who simply want to be able to follow their own dreams, like I did mine.

To me, it comes down to this: Women should be allowed to make their healthcare decisions without MITCH MCCONNELL's voice or Brett Kavanaugh's face haunting them at their OB/GYN appointment. So shame on those who want to take us back to the pre-Roe back alleys. Shame on those who don't dare regulate guns but want to regulate our uteruses.

I will fight with everything I have got to keep us out of those back alleys because it is the least that the women who came before us and fought for these rights deserve, and it is the least that our own daughters need. So enough of the hypocrisy, enough of the misogyny, enough of some men in hallowed halls of DC arguing that they know better than women in Illinois or Arizona or Missouri. We can and we must do better. That means proving that we care about women every day of the year, not just on one Sunday in May. That means codifying Roe now. Let's vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator from Texas.

ABORTION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last several days, the radical left has taken the debate about abortion to dangerous ends.

Last week, a liberal group launched an intimidation campaign against six members of the Supreme Court. They posted a map online with their home addresses and encouraged protesters to take their complaints straight to the Justices' doorsteps. No surprise as swarms of protesters heeded their call. They showed up at some of the Justices' homes this weekend.

Even though this plan was in the works for several days, the White House remained silent and refused to condemn this clearcut example of doxing.

It wasn't until yesterday morning, once the weekend's protest had concluded, that the White House Press Secretary said the Justices should be able to do their jobs without fearing for their personal safety or the safety of their families. And that wasn't the only alarming update from the weekend.

A pro-life group in Wisconsin was vandalized and set on fire on Sunday morning. The person or persons responsible smashed windows and attempted to use a Molotov cocktail. They left graffiti on the exterior wall of the building that read, ''If abortions aren't safe, then you aren't either.''

Threats of violence are never acceptable. It doesn't matter who is making the threat or who is on the receiving end. There is a world of difference between legitimate public discourse protected under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and threats or acts of violence which are not.

Every single person in this Chamber, especially our Democratic colleagues, should affirm that any demonstrations about this heated issue cannot threaten the safety of anyone, Supreme Court Justices, pro-life advocates, or otherwise.

This past weekend's events have highlighted the need to better protect the Justices and their families. They deserve the protection that, at this moment, the Supreme Court Police are not able to provide. Last week, Senator COONS, the Senator from Delaware, and I introduced a bill to increase protection for all nine Justices and their families. This basically would be the same sort of authorities given to the Capitol Police in protecting Members of Congress.

The events of this weekend have underscored just how important this is. This legislation was at the request of the Chief Justice, who wants to ensure that members of the Court and their families have the security and protection they need, especially at this tense time when Justices are facing enhanced threats.

We currently have two Justices with school-age children, and in the coming months, that number will increase to three once Judge Jackson takes her place on the Supreme Court Bench. I am glad this bill passed the Senate last night, and I hope our colleagues in the House will take it up and pass it in the coming days.

This week, the issue at the center of this turmoil will be a topic of debate here in the U.S. Senate. The Democratic leader has promised that the Senate will vote on a radical abortion bill that goes far, far beyond codifying Roe v. Wade.

This radical pro-abortion bill that Senator SCHUMER has set for a vote on tomorrow allows for abortions at any point during a woman's pregnancy, up until the time of delivery.

It does this by prohibiting States from protecting an unborn child's right to life as long as one healthcare provider signs off that a pregnancy would pose a risk to the woman's physical or mental health.

It isn't hard to see that this is a blank check for abortion providers like Kermit Gosnell. You may remember that Dr. Gosnell was a physician in Philadelphia, PA, who ran something called the Women's Medical Society Clinic but which was dubbed a ''house of horrors'' during his subsequent trial.

He was also a prolific prescriber of OxyContin, but in 2011 Dr. Gosnell and his wife Pearl and eight employees were charged with a total of 32 felonies and 227 misdemeanors in connection with the deaths, illegal medical services, and regulatory violations at his abortion clinic.

Pearl and the eight employees pleaded guilty to various charges in 2011, while Dr. Gosnell pleaded not guilty and sought a jury trial. After that trial, Dr. Gosnell was convicted of first-degree murder in the deaths of three infants and involuntary manslaughter in the death of Karnamaya Mongar, an adult patient at the clinic following an abortion procedure.

Gosnell was also convicted of 21 felony counts of illegal late-term abortions and 211 counts of violating Pennsylvania's 24-hour informed consent law.

After his conviction, Gosnell waived his right to appeal, and in an exchange for an agreement from prosecutors not to seek the death penalty, he was sentenced to life in prison without parole.

Not only does the radical abortion bill that Senator SCHUMER has teed up a vote on tomorrow usurp the constitutional role reserved to the States, it would allow a child born after 21 weeks of gestation to be aborted. Next month, a baby who was born at 21 weeks and 2 days will celebrate his second birthday. But this extreme legislation would invalidate all State laws that limit abortions after 20 weeks of gestation.

This wouldn't just impact pro-life red States; this change is so radical that it would invalidate existing laws in blue States as well. In Massachusetts and Nevada, for example, abortions are restricted after 24 weeks. In California, Washington, and Illinois, abortions are restricted after viability.

If this legislation were to become law, those laws would be preempted under the supremacy clause of the Federal Constitution.

Now, this sort of radical lurch and knee-jerk reaction to a draft opinion

illegally leaked by somebody at the Supreme Court—this reaction is way out of step with the views of most Americans when it comes to the sensitive and emotional issue of abortion.

A poll last summer found that 65 percent of Americans believe abortion should be illegal in the second trimester. Opposition to third trimester abortion is even stronger—an overwhelming 80 percent of Americans are opposed to late third trimester term abortions.

But under this legislation, States would have no power to stop the radical procedure known as partial birth abortion as long as one provider signed off that the mother's mental health might be affected.

What that is, is not defined and is left to the imagination. But just when you think it is bad, it gets worse. This bill would also invalidate laws that prevent abortion from being used as a method of sex selection. In other words, this legislation allows a parent who is hoping for a son to abort a baby girl.

This is a type of practice that sadly became common in China during the era of the one-child policy. It is not something that should happen in America.

Not only that, this bill undermines State efforts to protect unborn babies with disabilities, like Down syndrome. Unborn children being killed based solely on gender or disabilities is a devastating problem in other countries.

We cannot allow such grotesque practices to become mainstream here in America. America is better than that.

This bill that the majority leader has teed up a vote on tomorrow would also invalidate conscience laws, which protect healthcare providers who have deeply held objections to abortion.

Conscience laws are extremely common—46 States allow individual healthcare providers to refuse to provide abortion services.

This law that we will be voting on tomorrow would wipe away all of those existing State laws. Any healthcare provider who had a deeply held religious or moral objection to abortion would be required by Federal law to provide them anyway. Any healthcare provider who refused to do so could find themselves on the receiving end of a lawsuit.

This radical pro-abortion legislation removes a range of commonsense protections that exist in States across the country. It does away with State laws that limit the performance of abortions to licensed physicians, meaning nonphysicians could perform and prescribe abortions; and it provides no protection for babies who survive a botched abortion.

It invalidates informed consent laws, which require healthcare providers to share information about the baby with the mother, such as whether the child is capable of feeling pain.

And it gives the Attorney General of the United States sweeping authority to block State laws protecting the right to life.

This legislation would overturn existing laws and allow abortions on a scale our country has never seen before.

It is a sad commentary on the conscience of America when all but a handful of our Democratic colleagues are fighting to implement these radical policies.

As it stands today, the United States is only one of a handful of countries that allows elective abortions after 20 weeks. Other countries on that list of seven include the People's Republic of China, ruled by the Chinese Communist Party, and North Korea.

This should be a massive red flag for our colleagues across the aisle that our compassion for the unborn ranks right up there with the People's Republic of China and North Korea; but, unfortunately, they don't see the inherent humanity of these lost innocent lives.

The extent to which the Democratic Party continues to embrace such radical policies never ceases to amaze me.

As shocking as this legislation is, it is not entirely new. It already failed to pass the Senate once this year. It couldn't even earn the support of all 50 Democratic Senators. It failed on a 46–48 line vote. Democrats haven't made any changes that will move the needle in their direction in this bill that we will vote on tomorrow.

I simply do not agree that the American people want abortion laws in our country that put us on par with the Chinese Communist Party and North Korea—two of the world's most aggressive human rights abusers.

America cannot be its best if we do not value the lives of our most vulnerable. I believe babies—fellow human beings with heartbeats, fingerprints, just like the rest of us—deserve to have protection under the law—under State laws that would, if in the event Roe were overturned, be the ultimate arbiter of what the laws would be in those individual States.

The Declaration of Independence itself guarantees the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and I believe that right to life extends to the unborn, just as it does to every other American.

I have always believed in defending the right of the unborn to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and I will continue to fight this bill, no matter how many times the majority leader brings it to the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, Americans woke up to the news that was perhaps not unexpected but still stunning.

It appears that in a matter of weeks, we may soon live in a country where women have fewer constitutional rights than their parents or grandparents.

In one bold move, the ultraconservative, activist majority on the Supreme Court appears poised to erase the constitutional right to choose whether or not to carry a pregnancy to term.

I want to be clear: The leak of the majority draft opinion in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization is an unprecedented breach of the Court's confidential deliberations. It may harm the trust the Justices have with one another, as well as the public's trust in the Court.

Still, one must wonder, Why is it that our Republican colleagues have been focused so exclusively on the leak of the draft opinion rather than the substance of the opinion itself? And why do we hear in the last few days a continued reference to the security of Supreme Court Justices without a real discussion of where the proposed opinion will take us?

Let's make it clear—unequivocally clear—in a bipartisan fashion: Violence is never acceptable. Violence is never acceptable against Supreme Court Justices, their families, their staff, or anyone associated with that branch of government.

Nor is violence acceptable on January 6, 2021, in this Chamber, when the mob—the insurrectionist mob—leaving a Trump rally came here and tried to stop the business of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, and we left as fast as we could move out the back door to try to escape that. That was violence which led to five deaths and the assaults on 150 members of law enforcement. That violence is unacceptable as well, and I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle, who vetoed an effort for a bipartisan commission to investigate the violence of January 6, will step up now and say they were wrong.

Violence against a Supreme Court Justice, violence against a Member of the House, and a Member of the Senate—none of those is acceptable, period. Unequivocally. Period.

I am in favor of protecting the Justices, of course. I have been party to efforts in my home State of Illinois, after a tragic incident over 10 years ago, when a disgruntled client ended up killing a Federal judge's mother and husband in their home.

Since then, I have called for more security, and I am glad to add my name to this effort now to provide security to this Court and all the members of the Court, their families, and the staff who are involved.

It is unacceptable. Violence, either in this building or across the street, is unacceptable.

But I would like to speak as well to the substance of the statement just made by the Senator from Texas.

He recalled the case of Kermit Gosnell, a case where a doctor in Philadelphia was convicted, virtually of infanticide—repeated cases of infanticide—and he was sentenced, ultimately, to life in prison, where he still spends his time serving that out, with no chance of parole, nor should he ever have a chance at parole.

I struggle to get the connection between the crime of infanticide and the debate we are having, because there is nothing in the bill coming to the floor by the Democrats which is going to change that basic finding in the case in Pennsylvania.

That doctor, now removed from his profession and serving time in Federal prison, was guilty of a crime, and the bill before us on the floor of the Senate will not change that reality at all. I don't know if that was the inference, but I took it to mean that. I hope I was wrong.

We need to acknowledge the basics that a critical constitutional right may be removed by the Supreme Court.

I am an amateur historian studying the history of this country. I can't think of another time when a constitutionally guaranteed right by Supreme Court opinion of over 50 years has been removed by the Court. But that is what we face now—on the right of Americans to make the most basic decisions about their health, their lives, and their future.

Sadly, many Republicans are desperately trying to deflect from this ruling and what it means for every single American.

If the legal reason in the Court's draft opinion becomes final, that decision in Dobbs will end a half-century guarantee that the right to abortion is protected in our Constitution.

Republicans know that overturning Roe v. Wade and eliminating access to a woman's healthcare is extremely unpopular.

When asked point-blank whether we should do it, only 28 percent of Americans say that they agree.

In a world without Roe, Americans would not only be denied healthcare services they are entitled to, it is possible—it is possible—that some will be prosecuted.

Far-right lawmakers have been feverishly anticipating this moment. Over the past week, some of these same officials have introduced legislation around the country designed to punish women for making the basic decisions about reproductive health.

State legislators in Louisiana introduced a bill to allow prosecutors to bring murder charges against a woman who undergoes or anyone who provides an abortion.

The same Louisiana bill would seemingly call into question the legality of in vitro fertilization, as well as IUDs, the morning after pill, and other forms of emergency contraception.

I am glad I was on the floor a few minutes ago. My colleague, Senator DUCKWORTH, talked about her two little girls—cutest kids you can imagine.

I remember those kids from the earliest time. When I was in a car driving in the State of Illinois to an event in Bloomington, the phone rang and it was TAMMY DUCKWORTH. She was my colleague in the U.S. Senate and—she was going to be my colleague in the U.S. Senate, and she was a Member of the House of Representatives, and she told me that she was going to have a baby. I couldn't believe it.

TAMMY and I have known one another since a few weeks after her, I should say, terrible crash of the helicopter in Iraq. I had known what she had gone through, surgeries and recovery, and I was the one who encouraged her to run for office, and I am sure glad I did. She has become the voice of the military, the voice of veterans, and one of most powerful voices in the U.S. Senate.

And when she told the story about those two little girls, born through the process of in vitro fertilization, it struck home.

I am fortunate enough as a grandfather to have two in vitro grandbabies. I love them to pieces, and I thank goodness that there was a science achievement available to help my daughter deliver those beautiful kids.

A Republican lawmaker in Idaho said he is open to banning certain forms of birth control if this decision goes forward at the Supreme Court. He wanted to include plan B emergency contraception and IUDs.

Think about that. State by State, legislator by legislator, will decide what is acceptable when it comes to contraception.

Now, some people are going to think: DURBIN, you are exaggerating. Democrats are at it again exaggerating.

But I am old enough to remember before Griswold, the regulation of contraception in those days when it was virtually, in many States, even illegal to buy a condom.

And so you think I am exaggerating? We lived at that time.

It wasn't until Griswold v. Connecticut, decided by the Supreme Court, that established a right of privacy under our Constitution, which then led to Roe v. Wade. That was America. It was an America which, sadly, many Republican lawmakers long for.

A lawmaker in Missouri introduced a bill that deputizes bounty hunters to sue anyone who helps a woman seeking an abortion outside the State of Missouri.

I wanted to remind my colleague from Texas, who spoke just before me, it was the Texas bounty hunter's law that started this conversation in earnest.

In Texas, they decided that there would be a civil penalty that can be charged against those who were engaged in an abortion, and the person could claim that penalty if they disclosed that to the public.

Just a few days ago, the Republican leader in this body, Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, said that a national ban on abortion could be ''possible''—a national ban if Roe is overturned and the Republicans take control of the Senate.

Leaving it up to each State to decide a woman's reproductive rights is creating a patchwork quilt of uncertainty. Your constitutional rights would depend on your ZIP Code, but that is exactly the future we are facing.

To be sure, Democratic State legislatures will continue to protect access to abortion unless, of course, Republicans in Congress enact the national ban that Senator MCCONNELL said is possible.

In the absence of a national ban, if you can afford to travel, you will be able to access reproductive care in States like Illinois and Connecticut. But what about everyone else? If the right to have an abortion now depends on where you live or how much money you make, millions of women, many from historically marginalized communities, will face even greater hurdles in obtaining an abortion.

America already has one of the worst maternal mortality rates in the developed world. Drastically restricting access to abortion or banning abortion altogether will make those rates worse.

Republicans and anti-choice activists are trying to minimize the impact that erasing Roe would have. They talk about other times the Supreme Court has overturned precedent, and they argue—disingenuously, I think—that this is how the Court has always worked. It corrects its own past mistakes.

They claim that overturning Roe is no different than the Supreme Court overturning Plessy v. Ferguson—a decision which gave us the odious fiction of ''separate but equal'' that was later overturned by Brown v. Board of Education. But there is a profound difference. It appears that never before in the history of America has a Supreme Court decision to abandon settled law made Americans less free—never. In the past, when the Court has taken the serious step of overturning settled law, it has done so to expand freedom, expand opportunity, not eliminate it. What the activist, anti-choice majority on this Court will do is unprecedented, radical, and dangerous.

Here is another fact that Republican lawmakers are hoping you will not notice: It is not just the right to abortion that is in jeopardy; Justice Alito's draft opinion in the Dobbs case questions the very existence of the right to privacy. It argues that unenumerated rights—that is, rights not explicitly mentioned in the Constitution—must be deeply rooted in U.S. history and tradition in order to be recognized as a constitutional right. Who decides what is deeply rooted in history and tradition?

The Court's Obergefell v. Hodges decision established marriage equality only 7 years ago. Will the Court's reactionary majority put that next on the chopping block?

What about the right to contraception, as I mentioned before, established by Griswold v. Connecticut 11 years before Roe? A Republican Member of this body recently criticized that decision establishing the privacy right of every individual to choose the contraception

right for their family. He described this as ''constitutionally unsound.''

Rather than settling the debate on abortion, the draft Dobbs opinion would further divide our fractious Nation and set the stage for a radical majority in the Court to erase even more constitutional rights. It would give government the power to dictate your rights and dictate your future. That is why we must take action to protect women's productive rights.

Tomorrow, the Senate will vote on the Women's Health Protection Act. This bill will codify the right to provide or obtain an abortion free from medically unnecessary restrictions. The American people deserve to know where their Senators stand. I will not stop fighting for the right of every American, especially the women of America, to have these rights as established for over 50 years.

For years, the Republicans have claimed they are the party of families, the party of family values. Yet they have spent decades ignoring the needs of working families. Republicans are willing to force women to carry unwanted or unexpected or even dangerous pregnancies to term, but they are not willing to help them raise their children.

There are aspects of their voting patterns in the Senate that make it clear that when it comes to helping families with the basics, such as tax credits for children, making sure that families have paid medical leave for their newborns or other family members—all of these things are family friendly and family values. Unfortunately, they are not supported by many, if any, Republicans. That would be a demonstration that they truly care for families.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF ASMERET ASEFAW BERHE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today in opposition to the nomination of Dr. Asmeret Berhe, who has been nominated to serve as the Director of the Office of Science at the U.S. Department of Energy.

The Office of Science is the Nation's largest Federal sponsor of basic research in physical sciences. Its mission is to advance the energy, economic, and national security of the United States. This job, this mission to advance the energy, economic, and national security of the United States is one that I view as very critical.

Dr. Berhe has been a professor of soil biogeochemistry—soil biogeochemistry—at the University of California Merced for over a decade. Now, she has focused her research on soil management and sequestering carbon in the soil. Her background and her experience have very little to do with the Department of Energy's main scientific focus.

A May 9, 2001, op-ed in the Wall Street Journal by a physicist whose expertise is theoretical physics has noted:

> Ms. Berhe's research program on soil chemistry, exploring the capture of carbon dioxide, is relevant to climate-change policy. But her research expertise isn't in any of the Office of Science's major programs, and she has no experience as a scientific administrator and minimal experience with the Energy Department itself.

So not that there is anything wrong with her underlying experience to do other things, but for this specific position, the qualifications just aren't there. Dr. Berhe is clearly not the right choice to lead the Office of Science.

Certain positions Dr. Berhe has taken or endorsed are also concerning. On February 28, 2001, she retweeted this statement:

> I'm just going to propose that a nation that can land an SUV sized rover in an ancient lake on another planet can build an electrical grid that is not [f---ing] useless—

This is her retweeting—

because of slavish devotion to the free market.

Apparently, we are devoted to the free market, and she doesn't like it.

On May 7, 2015, she wrote in Science that ''the practice of farming'' is to blame for climate change. ''The practice of farming'' is to blame for climate change.

Dr. Berhe is not the right person to serve as the Director of the Office of Science. I rise in opposition to her nomination. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this nominee.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON PHILLIPS NOMINATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to start the vote.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Phillips nomination?

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) would have voted ''nay.''

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 162 Ex.]

YEAS—75

Baldwin	Hassan	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Risch
Blumenthal	Hirono	Romney
Blunt	Hoeven	Rosen
Booker	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Brown	Kaine	Sasse
Burr	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	Kennedy	Schumer
Capito	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Luján	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Sullivan
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Thune
Cramer	Menendez	Tillis
Crapo	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Fischer	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wicker
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	Young

NAYS—22

Barrasso	Ernst	Paul
Boozman	Hagerty	Rubio
Braun	Hawley	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Toomey
Cotton	Lankford	Tuberville
Cruz	Lee	
Daines	Marshall	

NOT VOTING—3

Lummis	Sanders	Scott (FL)

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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 senior assistant 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 to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 773, Asmeret Asefaw Berhe, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science, Department of Energy.

Charles E. Schumer, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark Kelly, Jack Reed, Catherine Cortez Masto, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood Hassan, Mazie K. Hirono, Tim Kaine, Tammy Baldwin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Patrick J. Leahy, Ron Wyden, Amy Klobuchar, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley.

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 Asmeret Asefaw Berhe, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science, Department of Energy, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.