

judge and reveal a level of bias and partisanship that is unacceptable in a judicial nominee.

Mr. Smith also has extensive right-wing political affiliations and ties to dark money entities. He has volunteered on dozens of Republican campaigns and participated in numerous events sponsored by conservative groups. He has also served as a board member of several Republican-aligned organizations, including super PAC and entities affiliated with Leonard Leo. Mr. Smith's record makes his extreme ideology and partisanship clear. It is equally clear that President Trump believes Mr. Smith will continue to place the interests of the President ahead of the interest of justice and the rule of law if he is confirmed. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing his nomination.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BRITT). The Democratic leader is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, Senate Democrats have been unwavering in calling for an immediate end to Trump's war with Iran, and we will continue to do so until his blunder is well and truly over.

For more than 100 days, I have come to this floor to denounce Trump's reckless and dangerous Iran war and demand its end. Now, it has been nearly 24 hours since Trump announced there was a potential deal with Iran, and we still don't know the details.

We have been told dozens of times that this war is over, and dozens of times we have been disappointed. There have been divergent statements from a variety of people in the administration. In these high-stakes negotiations, the devil is in the details. But Trump hasn't even revealed the text of his "understanding" with Iran. The American people need to know exactly what is in the deal. Trump must brief Congress and the public on the details of his understanding with Iran immediately and end this war once and for all.

Instead, Americans still have more questions than answers: Will our troops remain in harm's way? How does Trump plan to achieve any of the stated goals of his reckless war? What is the plan for the proposed "60 days of negotiations"?

There are still many unknowns about Trump's negotiations with Iran, but we know this for certain: We are worse off than before Trump began this foolish war of choice. The Iranian regime is more radical than before Trump began his war. Iran has more control over the Strait of Hormuz today than before the war began. Gasoline prices are still dramatically higher than before the war and will remain so for a long time.

Americans are scratching their heads wondering what we have accomplished in Iran. Make no mistake, the longer this war drags on, the worse all of this will get.

The biggest question Americans had at the beginning of this war was, What would Donald Trump get out of it and at what cost? But Trump answered that question: Thus far, nothing and at an enormous cost.

FISA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, now on Pulte and FISA and the SAVE Act, Senate Democrats have made it clear that however long Trump wants Bill Pulte to serve as Acting Director of National Intelligence is too long. Every minute Pulte spends as DNI is a minute he could spend undermining our national security and politicizing our intelligence community. No one wants his eyes or hands on this document, given his recklessness, his attack-dog stance whenever it comes to Trump.

The 18 U.S. intelligence Agencies are simply too important to entrust to someone as inexperienced, as blindly loyal to Trump, and as blind to facts as Bill Pulte, and that is not what we need in a DNI.

Trump's absurd demand to tie his radical SAVE Act—restricting Americans' voting rights—to FISA is also deeply reckless and demonstrates his true motives. The SAVE Act is perhaps the most vicious piece of anti-voting rights legislation Trump has ever come up with and it will not pass and it will not save FISA, Donald Trump.

Once again, Trump proves he has no problem undermining America's national security if he thinks it will help him politically.

(The remarks of Mr. SCHUMER pertaining to the introduction of S. 4781 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

NOMINATION OF JUSTIN D. SMITH

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, Trump's Eighth Circuit nominee, with his nomination of Justin Smith to the Eighth Circuit Court, Donald Trump continues—continues—to stack our courts with judges whose only qualification is their complete loyalty to him and his extreme far-right agenda. Smith checks all of Trump's boxes.

Smith currently serves as Trump's lead counsel in his case against E. Jean Carroll, who received \$90 million after jurors found Trump liable for sexually assaulting and defaming her.

Smith also helped prepare Trump's lead counsel for the Supreme Court case to grant the President absolute immunity to break the law.

A longtime Republican operative, Smith once wrote in 2007 that "abortion is murder, gay marriage is a sin . . . and on these principles of our party, there must be no equivocation."

In keeping with Trump's efforts to undermine America's elections, Smith also supported efforts to challenge the results of the 2020 election. Trump's nomination of Smith to the Eighth Circuit is part of his effort to undermine the rights of American people and to turn our justice system into a rubberstamp for his egregious crimes. I strongly urge a "no" vote from my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

IRAN

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, like so many of us here in the Senate and really across the country, I think we have all been watching the news this weekend to see whether or not we would have an announcement from the Trump administration on a possible agreement to reopen the Strait of Hormuz and ensure that Iran never develops a nuclear weapon, among other objectives. I think the news this morning was promising, and we are all waiting to see what the contours of that agreement will be.

We can debate the way the administration started this war, but I certainly stand here today genuinely wishing the administration all the best in ending this on favorable terms. It would clearly be good for the region and it would be good for the world if the Iranian regime stops funding terror and permanently abandons its nuclear ambitions. I think we can all agree to that.

Yes, while there appears to be a final agreement, we haven't seen it yet. We want to have a good deal from the U.S. perspective. We are going to learn more this week. As we do that, I hope that things will begin to reopen and that we will be able to stave off what has been rapidly approaching in our energy markets, and that is what I want to speak to more directly today.

We know the basics here. All across the country, people and businesses are just paying a lot more for fuel. We have seen the prices go down a little bit today—that is good news—but the fact of the matter is, we have all felt the impact from rising prices.

The price of oil went up substantially during the war, and so did the price of gasoline, the price of diesel, of kerosene, of avgas, and other fuels as well. That is taking a toll. It is simply more expensive to drive, and it is more expensive to fly and to buy groceries. According to one estimate, the average American household has paid nearly \$400 more for fuel since the start of the conflict.

As tough as that all is—and it has been. It has been very hard for many families. But it has also been somewhat tempered. For the past couple months, we have been emptying ships with fuel that had already transited the Strait of Hormuz. Some regional flows have been rerouted to bypasses. That has been good in terms of getting product out there. Some producers—

particularly here in the United States—have clearly stepped up their production, and we have seen how that has been able to soften things. China has reduced its imports, and refiners have adjusted their runs. So there has been a lot that has been going on in really trying to work to soften this impact. We have also tapped into commercial stocks and our emergency reserves through the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

We have benefited from some sound policies that this country has put in place. It was not too many years ago that I was very proud to be able to lead the effort to lift the ban on crude oil exports, which, as we have seen, has greatly stabilized the markets here.

So far, we have avoided the energy crisis that many thought inevitable after so much global supply went offline, but I don't think we are out of the woods yet. Global oil inventories are now dangerously low, and many in the industry are sounding the alarm, and they are telling us things like: We are running out of runway here; that we have depleted our buffers and our shock absorbers; that inventories have declined to levels not seen for 40-plus years. And once no cushion is left, it is just really hard—it is hard to keep those prices down when you don't have the absorber here. I hope we are going to be able to avoid that, absolutely, because the consequences could be catastrophic in some places.

As a Senator from Alaska, I am keenly aware that even if most of the country is able to avoid the worst, there are some who won't be able to escape it. In fact, some are already living through it, and they are living in my home State right now in communities like Ambler and Galena and Mountain Village. What they are seeing is the impact of these rising prices that unfortunately are high now, but it is really hard for them to see relief in sight.

Even if the Strait of Hormuz fully opens this week, even if regional production and shipping come back much faster than projected, these Alaskans in these communities and around my State will continue to face the repercussions of this war and will for months to come. It is them that I want to draw attention to because, quite honestly, they need some help. They need and deserve help from every level of government—starting in Alaska and primarily from the State of Alaska but extending to some reasonable actions we can take here.

Let me explain. How is the war in Iran impacting towns and villages more than 6,000 miles away in Alaska so much more so than in other places? Because I am hearing from all my colleagues that everyone is feeling the impact in their communities. So why am I standing here today to say that our situation is just a little bit harder, a little bit more challenging now, and why will those impacts continue even after the war is over?

So we can't have a discussion about Alaskan communities without putting

it in context of the whole. Alaska is big. We all know Alaska is big—one-fifth the size of the United States of America. If you stretched Alaska over the lower 48 States, we would stretch from Florida all the way to these Aleutian Islands, all the way out to California, practically from the Canadian border going south. It is big, and in the midst of all this big geography, we have some 200 isolated communities around the State—20 percent of our total population—that are not connected by a road system.

So all these that you are seeing here, all around the outline and the perimeter of the State, all the way up to the North Slope—all that—not connected by road, right? And down here in the section of the State where I grew up, this is all island, so nobody is connected by a road there. So you have the panhandle and the Aleutians and all of your coastline here that is not connected by road.

And so they are supplied by way of boats and planes to bring in the goods, to bring in food, the medical supplies, their mail, and their fuel, the fuel that they rely on. So many of these particularly small coastal communities, they are diesel-powered generation. So they rely on diesel to be able to keep their lights on. And sometimes they are offset by a little bit of wind, maybe a little bit of solar, but for the most part many of those communities are diesel-powered, so they rely on this as their fuel supply.

So how do you get your fuel? It is not like you can just call up the fuel barge any time of year—because once you get around here, you run into ice-choked waters all the way up to the top, rivers frozen over. And so in order to deliver the fuel, you have to wait until the ice has moved out, the ice has moved out of the area, melted.

And so this is the time of year. It is hotter than dickens here in Washington, DC, but back home the ice has really just left a matter of weeks ago to allow for these fuel barges to get up into this region to start resupplying these communities. So effectively what happens is, for most of these coastal communities and our river communities—the Kuskokwim coming up here and the Yukon coming up here is going all the way into Canada. For many of those communities, they get their fuel by the barges that come in here. They lighter on and take them up into smaller barges all the way up to rivers. So it may be July before they get the fuel, but it has really just started now, in June, where you see the first fuel delivered.

The second delivery is going to come typically in September before freezeup. And sometimes, in many of the river communities, it is just fuel delivery once a year because the water in the rivers may be low enough that you are not able to make it up all the way.

So it is expensive, right, if you have to haul all this. And I don't have my other map, but, you know, the State of

Alaska is sitting right up here. We have to go through Canada. We have to go through the Gulf of Alaska, around through the Aleutians, to get all the way up. Transportation costs are high. So fuel was expensive even in these communities before the war.

So if you think \$4 a gallon in Denver is bad, try \$9 a gallon in Dillingham. Four dollars a gallon is bad in New Hampshire, but up here in Nuiqsut, it is about \$14 a gallon. And these are prices that I had my interns check just last week. So these are the current prices. These are the current prices before we have had the spring barges coming in.

So think about what is happening in these communities. And in the hubs, like down here in Bethel or here in Nome or up in Kotzebue, the fuel barges—the spring barges—are arriving. And so the fuel prices that I just mentioned—\$9 a gallon in Dillingham or \$14 in Nuiqsut—those prices are going to go up. We are looking at estimates of perhaps 50 percent or more. So this is sticker shock.

It is tough enough to see the increase with those spring barge prices coming on, but then, keep in mind, this is not just a blip. This is not just a temporary increase. These prices are going to last for months because that is the only way they can buy their fuel. They buy it in bulk. So these shipments have to last them either for the rest of the summer, through September; or, again, for some, it has to last them through the end of the year.

So what happens is they are locked into the fuel prices that they have paid in just the past month, 6 weeks, 2 months. They had to lock in at these high prices.

So the hubs are facing strains, but costs are going to be even higher for the communities that are upriver or inland from them. And not every situation is going to be the same, but you are probably going to have to add another couple of dollars per gallon for most of those folks that are inland. In the King Salmon area, right around down in here, you have got a small road that connects you to Naknek. I will be going there in a couple weeks. You can get groceries at the AC store, but it is a 15-mile drive each way and fuel is running about \$9.11 per gallon. So you think about it; you don't just run off to the stores to go get some milk. It is not a cheap commute.

In Hooper Bay—here—where fuel costs almost \$10 a gallon, residents are now paying \$550 to fill up their fuel tanks. That is going to translate to more than \$1,000 a month this winter. And, again, even if the oil prices continue to fall, as we have seen just from the news this weekend—again, that is good, but my fear is that these communities that we are seeing and I am talking about are not going to be able to benefit from it because, again, they had to buy when the prices were high, and they are locked in now. So time just didn't work in their favor.

It takes about 3 months from the time of refinery order to deliver in upriver villages. So they couldn't just sit back and say: Well, we are just going to wait and see how this all plays out and hope for lower prices—because, if they do that, they risk not getting any fuel at all as we get closer to winter, the sea ice returning, and you are locked out. Then the only solution is flying fuel in 50-gallon barrels at a time. That is expensive.

So it is hard right now. And we seek to avoid the worst of the worst, but for some communities this has just been a really hard time. These are small communities. Some don't have the working capital to pay 50 percent more for their fuel. Again, so some are actually waiting and risking bad outcomes this winter because, again, they just might not be in a position to be able to buy their fuel.

Rural Alaska has faced an affordability crisis for some time. So when it suddenly intensifies like this, I don't even know—I don't even know what we would call it. But I can tell you this much. If you live in one of these rural towns and villages, you are wondering: How am I going to make it? How am I going to make it? Because this is the time of year where you need to be able to put—you need to fuel up your skiff to go upriver to go fishing so you can feed your family—because what you can get in the store was expensive before and is now more expensive. You need to be able to go out hunting for caribou, and so you need to be able to fill up your four-wheeler.

But, again, these are challenges that we have faced. And it is not only about food security. You are trying to figure out where else can I cut back because we have got to have the fuel in order to make it through the winter. None of these places are easy places to live—and particularly in the winter.

I got a letter just today—in fact, just a couple of hours ago—from one of the leaders from the AVCP region, and she starts off by saying “It is not too often that I am scared, but today I am.” And she speaks to the challenge of higher fuel costs, the concerns that they have with regards to accessing salmon and just being able to provide for their families. And I talk a lot about the rural communities because their situation is just so challenged right now, but it is not just in rural Alaska that we are seeing the concerns. Every Alaskan is feeling it. In Fairbanks, in the interior, where I went to high school, the local utility has, just last month, announced a new fuel surcharge for customers. It is averaging almost \$50—\$45.74 a month. Again, that is an add-on to already high utility bills.

These are the issues that emerge when your home State's ability to responsibly produce its resources has been choked off for decades, resulting in a pipeline system that is one-quarter full, less instate refinery capacity that you would otherwise have, and less space in the budget to build out new energy systems.

So my final point today is these folks, these Alaskans, are going to need some help. As I said, most of that should come from the State of Alaska because, in fairness, our budget has benefited from the war. Our State's treasury has been helped because of the higher prices of oil. And I do commend our State legislature. They have already passed legislation to provide a \$200 energy rebate to each Alaskan. They have doubled the cap on a bulk fuel revolving loan program. They appropriated more funding to it. They have made an allocation to school districts to purchase fuel. And they have brought back some community assistance programs. So I am pleased with some of the direction that they have taken. We are waiting for the Governor to sign those measures. But I think there is a possibility that our State legislature could do more in a future special session.

Here at the Federal level, I think we will have an opportunity to complement their actions, to help those hurt most dramatically, most immediately, by higher fuel costs. We can do things within some of the existing programs that we have. We can provide full funding and emergency contingency funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP. We can also appropriate funding for USDA's High Energy Cost Grants Program. The Denali Commission in Alaska administers this. We can look at a new mechanism to provide temporary assistance to those who are grappling with perhaps some of the heaviest of burdens.

And we can help, and I want to underscore that. So as this Chamber considers an Iran supplemental to replenish missiles, interceptors, radars, drones, and the infrastructure that we have lost, I would hope that some of these options might be on the table because, for some of our fellow Americans—especially those in rural Alaska—the impacts of this war won't end when a peace agreement is signed; it is going to continue long after, making life even more challenging.

So I share this with colleagues in an effort to explain some of what we face in a place that many feel is far away and very remote. But I would also suggest that we all have rural places in our States. We all have those communities that are challenged right now. So how we are there for them as they face these matters within their own families, to be there for them, is why we are here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

DACA

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam President, today marks the 14th anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known across the country as DACA.

As a Senator from California—home to thousands of Dreamers and DACA recipients—I stand here to acknowl-

edge the enormous impact of DACA, a program that has provided more than 800,000 young people a shot at the American dream—a chance to form families, buy a home, attend college, achieve a career, and pursue their dreams—and a chance to feel safe in the only place they have ever called home.

Today, we also reflect on the road ahead as we seek to achieve a permanent solution for Dreamers—a pathway to citizenship.

Most Dreamers arrived in the United States as children and have grown up in the United States and spent the vast majority of their lives here. DACA recipients—one of every four of whom lives in California—are part of the fabric of our communities and essential to our economy. They are interwoven in the very fabric of our society. They are our doctors, our teachers, our nurses, and our engineers. They are our neighbors and contribute nearly \$17 billion to the U.S. economy annually. They are our family and friends. They want to be our fellow citizens.

Despite the relief this program has provided in the past, hundreds of thousands of Dreamers and DACA recipients live day to day facing an oppressive uncertainty. They have faced that for years, living from one court case to the next, one Presidential whim to the next. With each passing anniversary, we are reminded how fragile this lifeline has turned out to be.

Because of this administration's draconian immigration policies, thousands of Dreamers and many others are living in a constant state of fear of deportation. Since the program was created, Republicans have tried to strip DACA recipients of their protections, repeatedly attacking the program in the courts, failing to support comprehensive immigration reform, refusing DACA recipients a pathway to citizenship, and creating significant delays in their ability to renew their status and work authorizations.

Right now, many DACA recipients are being forced out of their status and losing their jobs through no fault of their own. Under this administration, 261 recipients have been detained—261 DACA recipients detained—and dozens have been deported.

In March, I met with Maria, a DACA recipient from Sacramento. Maria was wrongly detained and deported just 24 hours after what she thought would be a routine immigration appointment. She has lived in the United States for nearly 30 years. Yet, even with her DACA protections, she was deported and separated from her daughter, causing enormous pain and fear. She is now back in the United States after a judge ruled her deportation unlawful, but this never should have happened in the first place.

Every month, I receive alarming letters from constituents concerned that their DACA status is going to be taken away and they will be separated from their family and friends.

Elidio, a DACA recipient from the Bay area, wrote in a letter to me:

I was recently diagnosed with stage IV colon cancer, and I was inquiring if you can help out with an inquiry on the timetable of the process. My work authorization is set to expire soon, and with it, the prospects of losing my health insurance, which I deeply rely on.

His life, his very life, depends on the renewal of his DACA application.

Another of my constituents, Ravina from the Inland Empire, wrote to express frustrations and deep concerns with ongoing renewal delays, which have already negatively impacted them. They came to this country as a 1-year-old. Now they are a civil engineer, living what they called “a dream come true” and contributing to California’s vital infrastructure and transportation sectors. But that dream has always carried with it the threat of expiration due to processing delays and the uncertainty of the program.

Ravina’s work permit lapsed due to deliberate delays on the part of this administration, and they are now on mandatory leave and at risk of losing their job entirely. They want to work. They want a stable future. They want, as with all DACA recipients, certainty—certainty that from one day to another, they will not be forced to leave this country, their home.

Another of my constituents, Marco from the Southern California area, also wrote to me, worried about the future. He works for a local health department while going to school to obtain a degree in microbiology. Since he doesn’t qualify for Federal student aid, he is paying everything out of pocket, working while a student to get by. Without his work authorization, he could lose his job and ultimately be forced to drop out of college.

These stories are real. Their constant worry is real. These Dreamers just want a permanent fix and a pathway forward.

My constituent services team is working diligently to assist DACA recipients with their applications, but we need something more permanent. We need to provide Dreamers a pathway to citizenship in this country and ensure that they and their families are not living in limbo, that they have the certainty they need to achieve the American dream.

Just recently, Congress voted to give ICE and CBP a budget so astronomical that it rivals the military budget of many industrialized countries—all in the service of a draconian immigration enforcement agenda that is anything but American. And this comes at a time when, instead of addressing our Nation’s challenges, American taxpayers are being forced to give even more to ICE and Border Patrol agents—more money to fuel a cruel immigration policy and raids that are separating families; more money for an out-of-control Federal police force without a modicum of accountability, including agents that have killed

American citizens in cold blood, in broad daylight, on video, for exercising their constitutionally protected right to free speech. These agents have broken into homes. They have refused to show their faces or their badges and have ripped children from their parents.

If we can afford \$70 billion more for these agents, why can’t we afford a clear path for Dreamers? Why can’t we afford to process work applications in a timely way? But of course we can if there is the will to do it. This administration could start fixing the delays that DACA recipients are facing. This won’t just help families across the country; it will also help stabilize the workforce and boost our economy.

But Congress itself needs to act as well because we failed at every turn to provide a pathway to citizenship for Dreamers, and it is within our power to do so.

President Trump once said that he himself believed Dreamers needed protection. He once said:

I’d love to be able to do something for them. . . . [T]hey should feel safe, but I’d like to be able to do something.

That was then. I guess we are living in a very different kind of now.

Nevertheless, this body should act. Members on both sides of the aisle should recommit today to work together to find a pathway to preserve, codify, and extend the DACA Program and provide all Dreamers a real pathway to citizenship.

I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled rollcall vote commence immediately.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Justin D. Smith, of Missouri, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

VOTE ON SMITH NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Smith nomination?

Mr. PAUL. 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 senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Sen-

ator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Ex.]

YEAS—48

Armstrong	Fischer	Moran
Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Ricketts
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Britt	Hoeven	Rounds
Budd	Husted	Schmitt
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Justice	Sheehy
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young

NAYS—43

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kelly	Schumer
Booker	Kim	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Markey	Smith
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallo	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—9

Bennet	King	McConnell
Cramer	Luján	Sanders
Curtis	Lummis	Warnock

The nomination was confirmed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). 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 actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. 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. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 760.

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 Michelle Steel,