

MEASURE PLACED ON THE  
CALENDAR—S. 4447

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4447) to allow women greater access to safe and effective oral contraceptive drugs intended for routine use, and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on Federal funding of contraceptive methods.

Ms. ERNST. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The junior Senator from Iowa.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT—  
MOTION TO PROCEED

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4447

Ms. ERNST. The so-called Right to Contraception Act goes far beyond the scope of providing access to contraception. It is important the American people understand what the Democrats are peddling.

Senator MARKEY's bill creates a precedent to mandate access to abortion drugs for women and girls of all ages. It also allows taxpayer dollars to be funneled to organizations like Planned Parenthood.

The bill removes conscious freedom protections, which allow our doctors and nurses to maintain their religious and moral beliefs while practicing medicine, a right that we are all afforded in the workplace which should be upheld.

I would like to remind my Democrat colleagues of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act—or RFRA is what we call it here. It is a law that was championed by Senator CHUCK SCHUMER more than 30 years ago.

The majority leader has really come a long way, hasn't he? Just like President Biden who used to be pro-life. Religious professionals and organizations across the country rely on RFRA for protection from broad government overreach. Yet the Democrats are willing to upend that precedent for politics and, more importantly, for abortion.

Let's be clear what is going on here. From the Senate to the White House, Democrats do not have anything to run on—no agenda that resonates with the American people. So instead, they are fearmongering in the name of politics.

Fortunately, Republicans have a solution: the Allowing Greater Access to Safe and Effective Contraception Act.

Like 90 percent of Americans, I believe routine-use contraception should be safe and accessible. That is why I have long worked to increase access to safe and effective over-the-counter oral contraceptives.

With my bill, we are ensuring women 18 and over can walk into any pharmacy, whether in Red Oak, IA, or Washington, DC, and purchase a safe and effective birth control option.

This Republican bill creates a priority review designation for over-the-counter birth control options to encourage the FDA to act quickly.

I am encouraged that as of this year, the first, but the only, over-the-counter option on the market has been approved. But having just one over-the-counter product on the market is just a starting point.

We need more options that are truly effective for women—women in rural areas, women facing domestic violence.

In addition, my bill brings much needed transparency and accountability in Federal spending to better understand where gaps are occurring and also to ensure dollars are actually going to supporting women and families.

GAO will take a 15-year look back at total dollar amounts for contraception reimbursement, inventory stocking, provider training, and patient education efforts to help better inform us as lawmakers and you as taxpayers on where and how our money is being spent.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 418, S. 4447; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The junior Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I have great respect for my colleague from Iowa, our neighbor to the south, but we just disagree on this issue.

I think that this is an attempt by Republicans to claim that they are increasing access to contraception when, in fact, this bill does not accomplish that goal at all. And I also think our Republican colleagues believe that they have a message problem when it comes to women's health when, in fact, they have a policy problem. And I regret to say this bill is not going to fix it.

One in three women in this country face barriers to accessing prescription contraception, and only half of women that are interested in over-the-counter birth control pills can afford them. But instead of addressing this very real and very well-understood challenge, this bill does nothing to improve access to contraception. It does not address the lack of insurance coverage for prescription and over-the-counter birth control—carve-outs that Republicans have repeatedly supported which make contraception more expensive for patients.

It does not protect patients from efforts to roll back the ability of providers to prescribe birth control. It

does not enable patients to know what is best for themselves to get birth control without unnecessary barriers.

Instead, the bill directs the FDA to prioritize review of applications to convert prescription contraception to over-the-counter; but, in fact, an over-the-counter birth control pill has been approved for almost a year and has been available in stores since March of this year. And this bill does nothing to get that product into patients' hands. In fact, it explicitly restricts access to this important product for young people.

This bill also directs a study, a Federal funding for contraception. We don't need a study to tell us that there are problems here. We know what the problem is. We know that President Trump's anti-abortion Justices at the Supreme Court and Republicans' years of policies here in Congress and in State legislatures around the country have restricted access to birth control.

In addition, this bill reinforces the misguided view that emergency contraception causes abortion. That is not what the science says, and it is not what doctors say.

If Republicans truly support increased access and fewer barriers to contraception, then they should vote for the Right to Contraception Act. Our bill would actually guarantee the right for people to obtain and use contraceptives and for health providers to provide contraception, contraception information, all free from government interference.

The Right to Contraception Act is the bill that we all need to support, and I look forward to voting for this bill this afternoon. And for these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The junior Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I am disheartened to see my colleague from Minnesota rise in opposition. I respect her greatly as well, and we do disagree on this issue. But, unfortunately, given the nature of this political exercise, I am not surprised.

This was never about finding real solutions. This was always about fearmongering and election-year stunts.

My effort, one that many of my Republican colleagues support, is a commonsense solution to give women more access to over-the-counter birth control options and bring accountability to government spending, not about finding loopholes so we can find a way to fund those drugs that cause abortions.

Despite attacks from the same far left that promotes drugs that endanger women, encourages the death of the unborn, I will always stand up for families. And as a mother and a grandmother, alongside my fellow Republican Senators, I will continue to protect life, while supporting policies that equip women to raise children to live the American dream.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I want to thank the Senator from Iowa for her legislation, important legislation, protecting the right to birth control and making it easier for women to have access to birth control pills over the counter.

This is something we all agree on. This is something Americans across this Nation agree upon. This is a right that is protected in all 50 States.

In just a few minutes, we are going to see Democrats engage in a show vote. And there is a reason for that show vote: because Democrats in the Senate—every one of them—their views on abortion are extreme and radical. Every Democrat in this body has voted repeatedly in favor of unlimited abortion on demand, literally up until the moment of birth—partial-birth abortion in the 39th and 40th week of pregnancy. That is an extreme position. I will tell you nationally, 9 percent of Americans agree with that position. Madam President, 91 percent of Americans look at that extreme position and say: That is too far.

And, indeed, even among those Americans who call themselves pro-choice and a majority of pro-choice Americans say, Late-term abortions up until the moment of birth, that is extreme. So what do the Democrats do? They recognize that 91 percent of Americans disagree with their extreme position, so they try to change the topic. And in particular, they are trying to change the topic to birth control.

Now, all 100 Senators—every single Senator—agrees that birth control should be protected as a matter of law. And yet what did we just see? We saw Senator ERNST introducing her legislation, legislation of which I am a cosponsor. Together, we are leading the fight to protect the right to birth control, and what happened? The Democrats objected.

Why did they object? Understand why they objected. Because they want to use this as an issue in November to scare people, and they don't want to talk about their own radical record. Instead, they want to falsely claim somebody is coming to take contraception. That is deliberately false. And so when you see millions of dollars of TV ads paid for by Democrats, ask yourself one question: Why did the Democrats just block Senator ERNST's and my legislation protecting the right to birth control? Because this is not about protecting this right; it is about politics for the Democrats hiding their own radical view.

I wish we would come together. By the way, next week I predict the Democrats are going to do the same thing. I have legislation protecting in vitro fertilization, another incredible medical miracle that, again, to the best of my knowledge, all 100 Senators support. KATIE BRITT and I together have introduced that legislation, and, yet, I fully expect next week the Democrats to do

what they just did today, which is object to it because they are playing politics and they are unwilling to actually put in Federal law a real and strong protection.

I know it is campaign season, but it is unfortunate that Democrats are not willing to work together. Had they not uttered two words, "I object," Senator ERNST and my legislation protecting the right to birth control would have passed out of this body. But Senate Democrats didn't want it to.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to ask that baby to come back into the spectators' Gallery. That was the sweetest noise we have heard here for quite some time.

#### RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Madam President, Senate Democrats are using their power in the majority to push an alarmist and false narrative that there is a problem accessing contraception. They proposed a bill which is more about a solution to find a problem. Today's vote is nothing more than scaring and misleading, misleading the American people.

Here are the facts. Let me show this graph.

There is no State or territory that bans access to birth control pills. We made this graph. Here you see all the States that ban birth control are in orange, and all of the States that allow it are in green. As you notice, every State is green. This is not an issue. Unless—unless—your candidate for President is running behind in the polls, and there is a need to make people frightened; to turn out on a false issue; to, hopefully, improve poll numbers. But misleading and scaring voters seem to be, in their mind, the only way they can get that extra support.

But don't be mistaken, the bill goes way beyond protecting access to the routine use of birth control pills or other contraceptives. There are plenty of reasons why Republicans oppose this legislation. Here is what the bill actually does: It defines contraception so broadly that it likely also includes a right to a chemical abortion pill. It eviscerates conscience protections for healthcare providers, overriding the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA. In fact, if enacted, this would be a first time a law explicitly waived RFRA.

Now, by the way, we are a pluralistic society. Some people are pro-life; some people are pro-choice. But we have tried to find peace on this issue. You don't find peace by eviscerating people's rights to follow their conscience, knowing that there is a provider down the street that could give the service that would be required under this law.

And, finally, the bill prioritizes abortion provider Planned Parenthood, preventing States or the Federal Government from prioritizing funding for life-affirming organizations.

This is not serious legislation. It bypassed the HELP Committee. Just kind of taken out, brought straight to the floor. Again, not seriously considered, rather a vehicle for political grandstanding. It is not a serious process but, rather, a political stunt designed to fearmonger and mislead the public in an attempt to sway voters in an election year.

Republicans should not play along. I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I also want to highlight my amendment to this flawed bill. While the bill is beyond improvement in current form, my amendment proposes to shed much needed light on another issue that has been pulled into the Democrats' political stunt of the month; that is, the fact that the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention has very little data on abortion, including on abortion survivors.

If the policy preference of the other party is to promote abortion on demand, the American people deserve accurate information on this policy's effects.

We were fortunate to meet a woman who survived two—two—abortion attempts this week. She testified in the HELP Committee.

And so as Democrats continue to push the chemical abortion pill on women, we may learn of more abortion survivors, when at-home, unsupervised abortions fail and put mothers at risk.

My proposal directs the CDC to include attempted abortions as a method of delivery and collect data on abortion survivors. It would also direct the Department of Health and Human Services to refer abortion survivors to applicable Federal programs for vulnerable and newborn children. If Democrats stand behind their abortion-on-demand stance, why would they not support this policy.

Nevertheless, I suspect the other party will not be interested in considering my proposal as part of this bill or any other political show vote that is scheduled in the coming weeks.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Right to Contraception Act. Now more than ever, it is vital to codify reproductive rights. The right to contraception is not merely a matter of health, but a matter of autonomy and equality. We must protect a women's right to access to reproductive care.

This week, the Senate will vote on the Right to Contraception Act. Since the U.S. Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*, those opposed to reproductive freedoms have consistently acted to restrict and ban access to reproductive health care, including abortion, contraception, and even IVF.

In his concurrence in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, in support of decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, Associate Justice Clarence Thomas directly called into question

the right to contraception as a logical outgrowth of the Dobbs decision. Since the decision came down, it has become clear that restrictions and bans on abortion are just the first step in withholding reproductive health care and access, preventing women and their healthcare providers making the best decision without government intrusion.

For almost 60 years, people have had the right to access contraception. In 1965, the Supreme Court ruled, in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, that States could not block married couples from being able to access contraception. This ruling paved the way for the 1972 Supreme Court decision in *Eisenstadt v. Baird*, expanding the right to contraception to unmarried people.

Despite these protections and 96 percent of voters supporting access to birth control, some lawmakers continue to attack this basic right. Just as with abortion, extremists are making moves to undermine and eventually eliminate women's right to access birth control.

Contraceptives offer substantial benefits to many women and families across America. Women's reproductive choices and economic opportunities are linked. Research demonstrates that when women are given more control over family planning and childbearing decisions, educational, career, and professional opportunities open up to them.

With the Supreme Court decisions on *Griswold* and *Eisenstadt*, access to the pill was associated with a 1.7 percentage-point increase in the margin of women in professional careers. The gender gap in the workplace can also be narrowed when women have access to the pill at a younger age. Women with access to contraception in their early 20s earned \$2,200 more per year by their early 40s than women who were not able to have access to contraception.

Although access to the pill correlates to an increase in women in the workforce, it is important to remember that there are an estimated 19 million women of reproductive age who live in contraceptive deserts.

Various findings on the role contraception plays in the lives of women and families reiterate the value of ensuring women continue to have full access to a range of contraceptive services and methods. It is abundantly clear that improved access to contraception contributes to economic and educational advancement of women in the United States.

As a result of the Dobbs decision and due to systemic inequalities, communities of color, young people, immigrants, low-income, and LGBTQ+ individuals face the consequences of this abortion ban. These communities are more likely to experience additional barriers to accessing reproductive health care. Birth control ensures more people can access the future they envision for themselves and their families.

I am proud that Maryland has been recognized as the first State to mandate contraceptive coverage in 1998. My State has long been a leader in supporting and protecting reproductive rights. On April 14, 2023, Governor Moore announced that the State would begin to stockpile mifepristone. Maryland remains committed to remaining a safe haven for abortion and reproductive health care access.

However, even in Maryland, where State law protects the right to choose, in April 2022, Governor Larry Hogan vetoed the Abortion Care Access Act. This act expands reproductive health care by allowing additional trained health professionals, including nurse practitioners, midwives, and physician assistants, to perform abortions.

Fortunately, Maryland's Legislature overrode this reckless veto, and the law took effect July 1, 2022. In response, Governor Hogan went on to withhold millions of dollars in State funds that was designated for the Abortion Care Clinical Training Program. Thankfully, Governor Wes Moore released those funds on his very first day in office in 2023.

This November, Marylanders have a choice to vote in favor of further protecting abortion by enshrining the right to reproductive freedom in our State's constitution. This would further impede the ability of opponents to take away abortion rights in the future.

This week, Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER will call a vote for the Right to Contraception Act, a bill I cosponsored that will codify the right to contraception to prevent further restrictions on reproductive health services for all Americans.

It is time to protect the right to birth control, and access to it, for all communities. The Right to Contraception Act is an especially important safeguard for these marginalized communities.

While it is urgent that we pass the Right to Contraception Act, we must also move forward other legislation, like the Women's Health Protection Act, which would codify *Roe v. Wade* and prevent States from continuing to enact restrictions of reproductive freedoms.

This Congress, the Senate has also had to reel in colleagues who put our military in jeopardy by blocking the promotions of senior members of our military to protest the Pentagon's abortion policy.

Despite the notion that the Dobbs decision would be the end of judicial action on reproductive health by handing authority to individual States, we continue to see challenges to reproductive rights elevated to the Supreme Court. Last year, I signed onto a bicameral amicus brief for Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine v. FDA to advocate for the FDA's appeal that supports nationwide access to mifepristone. In the next couple of weeks, we expect that decision, as well as one in a case chal-

lenging the legal obligation of doctors to provide life-stabilizing emergency abortion care. I am proud to have also signed an amicus brief on this case, urging Justices to ensure that emergency departments will also provide patients with the care they critically need.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have worked to dismantle barriers to women's health. The right to choose whether to have a child is fundamental, and it is a decision that should only be made by women in consultation with their healthcare provider, not with interference from Federal, State, or local governments. It is time for us to elevate the voices that truly know how much is at stake in the fight for reproductive freedoms. Lives are at risk in the generation and beyond.

We must vote to pass the Right to Contraception Act, and we must work every day until *Roe v. Wade* is the law of the land once again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today, every Senator must take a stand: If you agree all Americans deserve access to contraception, then vote yes on the Right to Contraception Act.

This bill simply says that if you want to access birth control or if you are a healthcare provider wanting to prescribe birth control, the government has no right to interfere. This is not a show vote; it is a "show us who you are" vote. And the American people are watching.

Up to 90 percent of Americans support access to contraceptives, but today one in five adults are worried that birth control is under threat. This is just one of the consequences of overturning *Roe*, so we have every reason in the world to vote yes today.

We should all agree that in America nobody should ever question if their ability to access contraceptives will be taken away. Sadly, that is precisely the fear more and more people feel today. Passing this bill will put those fears to rest and protect people's basic civil liberties.

So, again, it is all very simple: If you agree all Americans deserve to have access to contraception, then you should support the bill.

Thank you to Senators MARKEY, HIRONO, and others for championing this legislation, and let us all vote yes.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call, with respect to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed, be waived.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the vote begin now.

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

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 400, S. 4381, a bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

Charles E. Schumer, Edward J. Markey, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Richard Blumenthal, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Tina Smith, Tammy Duckworth, Alex Padilla, Margaret Wood Hassan, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Christopher A. Coons, Jeanne Shaheen, Gary C. Peters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 4381, a bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Leg.]

#### YEAS—51

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

#### NAYS—39

Barrasso	Cotton	Grassley
Blackburn	Cramer	Hawley
Boozman	Crapo	Hooven
Budd	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Capito	Daines	Johnson
Cassidy	Ernst	Lankford
Cornyn	Fischer	Lee

Lummis	Risch	Scott (SC)
Marshall	Rounds	Thune
McConnell	Rubio	Tillis
Mullin	Schmitt	Tuberville
Paul	Schumer	Wicker
Ricketts	Scott (FL)	Young

#### NOT VOTING—10

Braun	Kennedy	Sullivan
Britt	Menendez	Vance
Graham	Moran	
Hagerty	Romney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 39.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion was rejected.

The majority leader.

#### MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Just so the public should know, I switched my vote so we might reconsider and possibly vote on this again.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 669.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Rosner, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2027.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 669, David Rosner, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2027.

Charles E. Schumer, Joe Manchin III, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Jeanne Shaheen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Alex Padilla, Mazie K. Hirono, Ben Ray Lujan, Maria Cantwell, Peter Welch, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard Blumenthal, Mark Kelly, John W. Hickenlooper.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 670.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lindsay S. See, of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2028.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 670, Lindsay S. See, of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2028.

Charles E. Schumer, Joe Manchin III, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeanne Shaheen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Alex Padilla, Mazie K. Hirono, Ben Ray Lujan, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Peter Welch, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard Blumenthal, Mark Kelly, John W. Hickenlooper.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 668.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Judy W. Chang, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2029.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.