

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 167 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Luján	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—49

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	Young
Graham	Portman	Young

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The nomination is discharged and will be placed on the calendar.

#### 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 to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 848, Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, John W. Hickenlooper, Richard J. Durbin.

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 Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 168 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Blumenthal	Sanders
Booker	Booker	Schatz
Brown	Brown	Schumer
Cantwell	Cantwell	Shaheen
Cardin	Cardin	Sinema
Carper	Carper	Smith
Casey	Casey	Stabenow
Collins	Coons	Tester
Coons	Cortez Masto	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Duckworth	Warren
Duckworth	Durbin	Whitehouse
Durbin	Feinstein	Wyden
Feinstein	Gillibrand	
Gillibrand	Hassan	
Hassan	Heinrich	

NAYS—50

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Blackburn	Risch
Blunt	Blunt	Romney
Boozman	Boozman	Rounds
Braun	Braun	Rubio
Burr	Burr	Sasse
Capito	Capito	Scott (FL)
Capito	Cassidy	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Collins	Kennedy
Cornyn	Cornyn	Shelby
Cotton	Cotton	Sullivan
Cramer	Cramer	Thune
Crapo	Crapo	Tillis
Cruz	Cruz	Toomey
Daines	Daines	Tuberville
Ernst	Ernst	Wicker
Fischer	Fischer	Young
Graham	Paul	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being evenly divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Minnesota.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today at a pivotal time for women's rights in this country. I want to thank Senators BLUMENTHAL and MURRAY and many others, including Senator BALDWIN, for their leadership on this issue and on the Women's Health Protection Act.

We learned last week that it is very likely that the Supreme Court will overrule *Roe v. Wade*. The leaked opinion made it clear. It means the Supreme Court is on track to completely overrule *Roe*, stripping women of their constitutional right to seek an abortion. It will also be, I note, against the wishes of the somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of Americans who believe that this is a decision that should be made between a woman and her doctor—not with Senator CRUZ, not a bunch of politicians in Washington, but a decision that should be made between a woman and her doctor.

Fifty years stripped away of women's rights, and the fall will be swift. Over

20 States already have laws in place that could be used to restrict access, including 13 which will automatically go into effect if the Supreme Court issues the decision. We have also seen States preparing to take even more extreme steps if *Roe* is overturned. Last week, Republican lawmakers in Louisiana advanced a bill to immediately classify abortion as homicide and allow the State to prosecute women—prosecute women—for receiving care. Earlier this year, a bill was introduced by Republican legislators in Missouri to allow private citizens to sue people who help women leave the State to get care. This comes on top of the 19 States that already have laws in place to ban or restrict access to medication abortion.

What this all comes down to is a fundamental question: Who is making these personal decisions—politicians or a woman? And are women equal citizens under the law? If *Roe* is overturned, women in this country will receive different treatment under the law than men, and our access to critical care will be at the mercy of a patchwork of laws.

We have all seen what happens on the ground when these kinds of restrictions are enacted. Texas's law last year denies access to at least 85 percent of patients seeking abortion-related services. Some women in Texas have had to drive nearly 250 miles one way to get care. No one should have to take a bus across the country to make a personal healthcare decision. A woman in Louisiana or in Missouri or in Texas should not be treated differently than a woman in Minnesota.

While we are all deeply disturbed by the impact this decision will have on women and the men who stand with them, unfortunately, many of us have seen this coming. Republicans have been methodically preparing for this moment, stacking the courts with judges who want to overturn *Roe* and introducing over 500 bills in States across the country limiting access to care.

While this is still a draft decision, I am seriously concerned that the Court's apparent willingness to disregard nearly 50 years of rights will not only put women's health at risk but will undermine the rule of law.

This draft leaked opinion brings us back to the fifties. The issue is, we always thought it would be the 1950s when it is truly the 1850s. The people of this country do not want to go backwards when it comes to their freedoms, because that is what this is about—their freedom to make their own decisions.

So what can the Senate do in the face of this threat to freedom? All three branches of the government have a responsibility to protect people's rights, and if one branch doesn't do its job—that is how this system was set up constitutionally—then it is up to another to step in.

Congress must act to codify the principles of *Roe v. Wade* into law, and we

will have the opportunity to do just that on the floor today when we cast our votes on the Women's Health Protection Act. These protections are desperately needed, and it is our responsibility to take action so that this fundamental right remains real for the women and the men who stand with them across this country.

Freedom and equality under the law, for the first time in generations—and I want young people out there to think about this—we may live in a world where women have fewer rights than their moms or their grandmas. That is not the world we want.

I urge my colleagues to stand up with the majority of Americans who support a women's right to make her own healthcare decision, the freedom to make her decision, by enshrining the protections of *Roe v. Wade* into law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have never seen so much furor over a case that has not been decided, based on a leaked draft dated February of this year which does not reflect a final decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, this egregious leak of this draft opinion has created serious security threats for members of the Supreme Court and their families. Over the last few days, angry protesters have shown up at three of the Justices' private family homes. Sadly, the majority leader of the Senate said he is OK with peaceful protest outside the Justices' homes.

I disagree, and so does his second in command. This morning, Senator DURBIN called this practice "reprehensible."

The threats to Justices remain high because emotions are high, and the Chief Justice has asked Congress take action to protect the Justices and their families by simply providing the same sort of authorities that the Capitol Police have to provide protection to Members of Congress and our families.

Last week, I introduced legislation that would do that. I asked my friend and frequent collaborator, Senator COONS, if he would be interested in co-sponsoring the bill to make it bipartisan.

Initially, he raised concerns with one of the provisions, but we worked in good faith to address his concerns and introduced a new version of the bill that could gain broad bipartisan support.

And, clearly, we were successful because our bill passed the Senate unanimously on Monday, and now it is time for our colleagues in the House to follow suit.

Yesterday, Congressman ISSA and Congressman CORREA introduced this bipartisan bill in the House, and Speaker PELOSI should act quickly to bring this bill up for a vote as soon as possible.

Unfortunately, some in the House disagree. They have chosen to ignore

the bipartisan bill that received unanimous support in the Senate and have introduced a partisan version, which is guaranteed to slow down the protections needed by the Supreme Court Justices and their families.

This partisan bill in the House ignores the good-faith work that was being done here in the Senate to build consensus and expands this legislation to include divisive provisions, like potentially extending police protection to the very person who leaked the draft opinion.

Well, this stands no chance of becoming law.

At the end of the day, here is where we are: The Supreme Court Justices and their families are facing serious security threats, and the Senate unanimously passed a bill to provide them with the protection that they need and they deserve. I can't think of any good reason why House Democrats would delay a vote on this bipartisan bill, or, worse, allow the safety of the Justices' families to become a political football.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. President, on another matter, later today, the Senate will vote on a radical abortion-on-demand bill, which our Democratic colleagues are trying to sell as a codification of *Roe v. Wade*.

But the truth of the matter is, this bill sweeps aside all of the protections, for example, for conscience, for religious liberty, for opposing taxpayer funding of abortions, and partial birth abortions. It sweeps all that aside and essentially makes abortion available on demand from the time of conception until the time of delivery.

Now, this isn't the first time our friends across the aisle have tried to opportunistically capitalize on events to check items off of their liberal wish list. In fact, we have witnessed this strategy numerous times.

When the pandemic first hit, the House Democratic whip referred to the crisis as a "tremendous opportunity to restructure things to fit [their] vision." And to their credit, our Democratic colleagues certainly didn't squander that opportunity.

Last year, they crafted a nearly \$2 trillion spending bill that included most of the far left's outbox, their biggest priorities, and they tried to brand it as necessary pandemic relief, which it was not. Backdoor funding for Planned Parenthood, a blank check for mismanaged union pension funds, money for climate justice—it was easy to see through this COVID relief facade because, in the end, less than 10 percent of the money was directly related to the pandemic, and less than 1 percent supported vaccination efforts.

We saw the same play when it came to election law. States across the country established temporary measures during the pandemic to ensure that voters could cast a ballot during some of the most worrisome days of the pandemic.

When those temporary procedures were rolled back to what they were be-

fore the pandemic, our colleagues tried to frame that as voter suppression. They resurrected a bill that would force a one-size-fits-all election formula out of Washington, DC, on every State and community in the country and, in the process, hand Democrats a permanent governing majority.

And Democrats tried to cast anyone who opposed their partisan bill as attacking the sacred right to vote, which it was not.

But here we are seeing the same play once again. Our colleagues are now trying to seize on the political firestorm from a stolen Supreme Court draft opinion to push their radical abortion agenda. And no doubt about it, it is truly extreme.

Just as they did with their pandemic spending spree and election takeover bill, Democrats have taken things to the very nth degree, and they are pushing for a bill that is far out of line with the views of most Americans over this divisive and emotional topic.

Only 19 percent of Americans say that abortion should be available in all cases, with no exceptions—19 percent. That means 81 percent disagree.

Even though the vast majority of Americans oppose unrestricted abortion access, that is exactly what this bill would provide. This bill would allow for abortions at any stage of a pregnancy. All it takes is one healthcare provider who says having the baby would present a potential harm to the mother's health, including her mental health.

And I mentioned yesterday the case of Kermit Gosnell, who ultimately was serving life in prison for running an abortion factory involving late-term abortions and other illegal abortions performed in Pennsylvania.

So where is the line here? Where is the line?

Democrats see no line. They don't credit an unborn child with its very humanity or else they would see some sort of balancing against the mother's right to physical autonomy and the child's right to life guaranteed in our Declaration of Independence.

Is anxiety about motherhood a strong enough diagnosis to allow a woman who is 39 weeks pregnant to abort her baby in a late-term abortion? Anxiety can be a serious struggle that many prospective mothers face. There is no question about that. That is why I have been advocating for better access to mental healthcare services for all Americans, including expecting and new moms.

But this legislation is written so broadly that in practice, it legalizes abortion for virtually any reason up until the time the baby is actually delivered.

Now, the American people aren't the only ones who oppose unlimited abortion on demand. This bill doesn't just codify *Roe v. Wade*; it goes far beyond the abortion policies among other countries, like those in Europe, for example.