

Many have never had to worry about that.

But, today, we are grieving with the Eramo, McKenna, and the Wayment families. All three soldiers were married. Mr. Wayment also had three young children that he leaves behind.

Scripture tells us that “the Lord is close to the brokenhearted and saves those who are crushed in spirit.”

And to the families, I know no words can lessen your grief, but I hope you will find some small measure of comfort in knowing that Christopher, Stewart, and Kyle were heroes and that they will always be remembered as such.

I know that the Fort Wainwright and the Fairbanks communities are absolutely heartbroken. There are families and brothers and sisters in arms who are grieving today. They are attending a private memorial service for their fallen comrades this afternoon in Alaska. My husband Verne and I offer our deepest condolences to them. Know that we are keeping all who serve in our prayers and all who are no longer with us.

This has been an awful, awful tragedy. There is one small sliver of light, however. There was a fourth servicemember who was injured in that same crash. He was treated at Fairbanks Memorial Hospital, and he has now been released. We are told that he is recovering at home. A full recovery is expected. So, hopefully, this can be some small bit of hope to the Fort Wainwright and Fairbanks communities that are suffering this loss.

It is, indeed, a sad moment for this military community, our interior community—know that in our golden hearts we will hold these men and their families tight.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

DEFEND OUR NETWORKS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, over a decade ago, when President Obama was in office and Apple's iPad was just hitting the market, our intelligence agencies began to notice a disturbing pattern. Chinese-made communications equipment was multiplying across our country, placed on top of cell towers throughout the Midwest.

Equipment made by Chinese State-backed companies like Huawei and ZTE spread across my own home State of Nebraska, as well as nearby Colorado and Montana.

Curiously, these technologies were clustering near critical military locations in midwestern States. Nebraska is home to sensitive areas, like Offutt Air Force Base and a number of nuclear missile silos.

Well, the FBI looked into it. And they discovered that at least one Chinese company—Huawei—was regularly selling its equipment to rural providers at cheap prices that appeared unprofitable. But once installed, the equipment

would be located right next to American military assets.

The Chinese Communist Party is actively seeking ways to disrupt Department of Defense communications. And that is why we cannot allow communications equipment made in China next door to our military sites.

This is just one example of the pervasive threat Chinese-made equipment in our communications networks poses to our national security.

We know that the Chinese Communist Party intends to exploit these vulnerabilities for all kinds of activities, including espionage.

That is why, in 2020, the Federal Communications Commission banned the use of its funds to expand or maintain networks containing any Huawei or ZTE equipment. Since then, the Commission banned all equipment authorizations for several Chinese tech firms that pose threats to national security—blocking their imports and sale.

We also passed a law in Congress approving \$1.9 billion to secure our communications infrastructure—to rip out the Chinese network gear and replace it with secure equipment.

It has been years, but not all of this dangerous Chinese gear has been replaced. Approximately 24,000 pieces of Chinese-made equipment remain in 8,400 different locations across our country. Nearly all of the 85 companies approved by the FCC are still waiting for that Federal reimbursement money, because they aren't able to pay to replace the technologies without help.

The FCC's program is facing a budget shortfall of \$3.08 billion. The sum of money that we first approved based on initial estimates is not going to cut it.

That financial uncertainty means smaller, regional carriers—after being mandated by the Federal Government to rip out the equipment—won't receive the money they need to replace that high-risk Chinese technology.

I have heard from rural carriers that this basically leaves them with two options: one, go out of business; or, two, to never replace the equipment after they remove it, and, instead, that would reduce the size of their wireless networks.

Either option would be devastating for communities, especially communities in rural areas. We need more, not less, connectivity. And we need more, not fewer, jobs.

That is not just true in Nebraska but across this country.

Think about it. If these carriers go out of business or they reduce coverage, that is going to leave thousands of residents without wireless services—services that are essential for work, emergencies, and life in the 20th century. And people traveling through these vast areas of our country, they often won't have any services either.

Addressing this funding shortfall is urgent. The FCC has a July 15 deadline by which reimbursement requests are

due. If Congress doesn't act quickly to fix this issue before that July deadline, there won't be enough funds to cover costs. This would impact communities in 49—49—States, plus our United States territories.

Without action now, we face incomplete removal of high-risk Chinese equipment from U.S. networks—wasting the money that Congress has already passed.

I have introduced the Defend Our Networks Act to remedy this problem. Protecting our national security is vital, and it is also vital that we ensure the government's response to protect our security does not put smaller companies out of business.

The Defend Our Networks Act does both. It would allocate \$3.08 billion of unobligated COVID-19 emergency relief funds to the rip and replace program. That is only 3 percent of the unobligated emergency funds.

I introduced this bill with my colleague Senator HICKENLOOPER because securing our communications infrastructure, it is a national, it is a bipartisan, issue. The FCC commissioners, including Chairwoman Rosenworcel, have come out in strong support, demonstrating the importance of getting this done. Just a week ago, I had the opportunity to question Secretary of Commerce Gina Raimondo about this big problem that we have, and she agreed that we must address it immediately.

Over the coming weeks, I expect that we will continue to gain more bipartisan momentum. And I will continue to push for the swift passage of the Defend Our Networks Act, even as stand-alone legislation.

Spy balloons and secret police stations have recently reminded us of the Chinese Communist Party's sly and underhanded espionage tactics. If we cannot completely remove risky Chinese telecommunications equipment, how can the American people expect us to defend them from the threats that China poses?

We did the right thing when we passed the Secure and Trusted Communication Networks Act to establish the rip and replace program. Now, let's do the right thing again by completing the funding so that we can follow through on what we said we would do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, since President Biden took office, he and our Democratic colleagues have been on a

mission—a mission to replace every car in America with an electric vehicle.

Think about that for a minute. There are 280 million cars on the road in America, and our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle want to replace every single internal combustion engine with a big battery with wheels on it, known as an electric vehicle. They are determined to please the Green New Deal enthusiasts by shoveling mountains of taxpayer money into this effort, and they are making some headway.

Last summer, our Democratic colleagues abused the rules of the Senate to spend hundreds of billions of dollars on something called the Inflation Reduction Act, which, in true Washington form, does not actually reduce inflation. But that is the name they gave to it. More importantly, this massive bill included a variety of pet projects, from a supersized Internal Revenue Service to handouts for rich folks who want to buy electric vehicles.

Wealthy Americans, the only ones who can afford these expensive cars, can receive up to \$7,500 in taxpayer assistance to buy an electric vehicle. So, in effect, you and I and everyone in the country is subsidizing, with our tax dollars, a private, well-to-do person to buy an electric vehicle, most of which costs in the \$60 to \$70 to \$80,000 range and up.

Democrats passed this bill at a time when most people can't afford their basic expenses. That is because of inflation, another product of profligate spending. Working families are struggling to keep up with the cost of everything from gasoline to groceries, to rent and electricity. Our Democratic colleagues responded by forcing every person in America to subsidize wealthy people's purchase of an electric car.

Initial estimates pegged the costs of these EV tax credits, as they are called, at just over \$30 billion. That is a lot of money. But private forecasters have recently reevaluated that number based on more precise projections. They said that the actual cost of the electric vehicle credits will be closer to \$196 billion—6½ times higher than advertised.

Again, hard-working families are suffering under inflation. When everything costs more, their purchasing power is diminished. Washington, DC, and our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle said: Well, your life is not quite hard enough; so we are going to make it harder. We are going to force you to subsidize wealthy people's purchase of these cars.

Unfortunately, that is not the end of the story. The administration recently rolled out new rules to ensure—or at least to claim—that, by 2032, two-thirds of new passenger vehicles sold in the United States will be electric.

By 2032, President Biden will be long gone. Probably many Members of the U.S. House and Senate will no longer be in office. Nevertheless, the administration says that, by 2032, we are going

to mandate that two-thirds of new passenger vehicles be run on batteries, be electric.

Of course, this announcement was met with applause by those who think that every driver in America should drive an electric vehicle, that somehow this is the price that has to be paid in pursuit of climate change or to combat climate change.

But everybody else in America understands this is an unrealistic mandate because, like I said, with 280 million cars on the road, only about 6 percent max of the new cars sold in America are electric vehicles—only 6 percent of the new cars sold.

But the Biden administration says that, by 2031, two-thirds of the cars have to be electric vehicles. So making the leap from 6 percent to 66 percent—which is two-thirds of the new car sales—in less than 10 years is an impossible task, and it comes with a lot of risks and hurdles.

One of the most obvious ones is cost to consumers. At the end of last year, the average price of a new electric vehicle—this is just the average price—was more than \$61,000. That is only a few thousand dollars less than the median household income in my State.

Most families don't have tens of thousands of dollars to spend on fancy electric cars. As we have seen over the last few years with inflation, people are already struggling to keep up. They are not in the market for a fancy new electric vehicle that costs more than they make in an entire year.

Another big issue has to do with how these vehicles are going to get powered. One of my favorite questions for my friends who are enthusiasts for this mandate and these taxpayer subsidies—one of my favorite questions—is this: Do you actually know where electricity comes from?

No, it is not just that wall socket that you plug an appliance into. Electricity is generated by the same source that produces most of our other energy: natural gas, some nuclear, some coal, some other types of energy—hydroelectric energy, depending upon the location. But all of that energy use, including fossil fuels, is needed to produce affordable energy that then becomes electricity, that you can then plug your vehicle into.

So this pie-in-the-sky idea that we are going to somehow cool the climate by everybody driving an electric vehicle is just—well, it is unattainable, and it is, frankly, ridiculous.

Last year, 60 percent of America's electricity was generated by fossil fuels, including 40 percent by natural gas and nearly 20 percent by coal. Despite the fact that we will need these energy sources to power the electric grid and charge electric vehicles, we know the folks on the left side of the political spectrum have waged a war on fossil fuels. Well, this will turn out about as well as Europe's dependency on Russian oil and gas, on a sole source of energy, which they found out did not

turn out well at all once Russia invaded Ukraine and they tried to diversify their energy sources. Putting all of our eggs in one basket with unrealistic goals and mandates to achieve a social outcome is bound to be unsuccessful.

Our colleagues across the aisle have also made these energy sources more expensive by instituting a methane fee and tax hikes on energy producers, which, invariably, get passed on to the consumer; and they are consistently, it seems, trying to make fossil fuels less affordable in order to push our country toward renewables.

Now, don't get me wrong. I am not opposed to renewables. We generate more electricity from wind turbines in Texas than any other State in the Nation. One reason our State continues to prosper economically is because we have the most affordable energy costs that come from an all-of-the-above strategy. We don't try to put all of our eggs in one basket—that is bound to be unsuccessful. We say: Well, let's do as much as we can using renewables—solar, wind—but we are also pragmatically clear-eyed about where electricity comes from, and we need all of the above.

So one big important issue that I think was overlooked when the Inflation Reduction Act was passed by strictly Democratic votes in the Senate is that renewables only accounted for 22 percent of America's electricity generation last year—22 percent. It is growing, but it is not nearly sufficient to generate the electricity necessary to charge your electric vehicles.

Either consumers have low-cost, reliable energy from fossil fuels or an all-of-the-above strategy, or else, they are condemned to an expensive and unreliable grid powered only by renewable energy sources. Those are the only options at this point, and I am afraid that is exactly the path that our Democratic colleagues are heading down.

But since COVID-19 hit, we have seen what happens to vulnerable supply chains for the components we need to do all sorts of things. We spent a lot of time and money and focus on advanced semiconductors. That is really important because if we lost access to those advanced semiconductors, it would tank our economy and it would also jeopardize our national security. But the supply chain for electric vehicles is a vulnerable one as well. The feature that differentiates electric vehicles from those with an internal combustion engine is a battery. And, actually, what you can think of is the electric vehicles are like a battery on wheels run by a computer. And—this should really come as no surprise, but you would think this would have been vetted before—here is where batteries come from.

Last year, China's battery manufacturing capacity accounted for 77 percent of the global total. Its production capacity is greater than that of the rest of the world combined. You can

see Poland at 6 percent, the U.S. at 6 percent, and everybody else is at just 11 percent.

China is home to 6 of the world's 10 biggest battery makers and completely dominates the global battery-manufacturing market. Nobody else even comes close. By 2027, it is estimated that its manufacturing capacity is expected to increase nearly sevenfold—sevenfold. In that same timeframe, the United States is expected to see a twelvefold increase, but we are starting at 6 percent. That is not going to get us anywhere near where China is or where they will be by 2027.

China will still command more than two-thirds of the world's battery-manufacturing capacity and the United States will be in second place with a measly 10 percent. Anyone who doesn't recognize and appreciate this issue hasn't been paying attention. Over the years, the Senate has been spending a great deal of time analyzing and addressing supply chain and particularly security gaps. As I had said, the pandemic taught us many lessons—many tough lessons—but one was the importance of a resilient supply chain. And we tried to make sure—we tried to learn from that so those lessons would not be in vain.

I mentioned semiconductors. That may be the best example. The global chip shortage affected everything from personal electronics to cars to defense assets and critical infrastructure.

We came to appreciate the hard way how reliant we had become on other countries for these semiconductors, these integrated circuits. And that made us incredibly vulnerable to another pandemic, to a natural disaster or, heaven forbid, a military conflict in the Taiwan Strait.

So Congress responded appropriately by creating the CHIPS Program to bolster domestic chip manufacturing and close this massive security gap.

But now our Democratic friends seem content to replace one vulnerability with another. As they continue to push for arbitrary and unrealistic electric vehicle goals, we will find ourselves in a similar situation when it comes to the batteries necessary to run these electric vehicles. To be blunt about it, we will be at China's mercy which, as we all know, is a very dangerous place to be.

Despite the fact that China dominates the supply chain for the critical minerals used to produce batteries, most of those minerals are not actually mined in China. They come from reserves around the world. The Democratic Republic of Congo, for example, is home to the world's largest cobalt reserve. Indonesia is the leading producer of nickel. And three of the largest lithium reserves are concentrated in South America in Argentina, Bolivia, and Chile.

Critical minerals are not safe from Chinese influence just because they are mined beyond China's borders, because China has made a huge investment in

processing those critical minerals in China. In other words, they are mined in these countries, exported to China for processing, where they control access to the critical minerals that are needed to build batteries, among other things. China has aggressively increased its own processing capacity.

Part of the problem, I might mention, is because it takes so long and requires an arduous, bureaucratic Rubik's Cube in order to get a permit to build things in America. And that is true whether it is from fossil fuels or the transmission lines from green energy that can transmit the electricity generated from wind turbines in Texas or anywhere else. You don't have those problems in China. They also don't have the same concerns we have for the environment.

As we know, China is building more coal-fired power plants than any other country in the world. What happens in China does not stay in China when it comes to those emissions.

So, right now, we have a general sense of the problems that we are confronting, but we are lacking some specifics when it comes to critical minerals, particularly. We don't know what reserves are under the control of foreign adversaries. We aren't guaranteed to receive a heads-up before major deals are made regarding mining rights and processing. Indeed, China has shown itself to be expert at operating surreptitiously under the cover of companies that sound like they come from somewhere else, where actually the People's Republic of China—the Chinese Communist Party—actually has controlling interest in those companies.

So we are not able to identify the many risks of the global supply chain or critical opportunities for new trade partnerships. We need to address the blind spots that are protecting China's dominance in critical minerals and battery production. And we are not going to be able to do it overnight and certainly are not going to be able to meet President Biden's goal of two-thirds of new cars being electric vehicles by 2032. It is just not going to happen unless we are going to go to China and get those batteries.

So a number of us are working to try to solve the problem. I think that is the appropriate response.

I hope this is a topic where we can work together and that we are in bipartisan support, much as we did on the CHIPS Act, where Senator WARNER, the senior Senator from Virginia, and I introduced that bill back in June of 2020, and we ended up passing that into law, as I indicated earlier, because both sides of the aisle saw a need to come together and come up with a solution.

We need a solution in this area, too.

Well, our colleagues on the other side have repeatedly prioritized some ideological obsession with all electric vehicles over the practical ramifications. Most Americans can't afford to purchase these pricey vehicles. Given the

war on fossil fuels, our electric grid may not be able to sustain them, even if they could. By increasing our reliance on battery-powered vehicles, we are certain to increase our reliance on China. Given the major costs and risks, you have to ask, is this really worth it? Can we afford the risks? Will it actually—can it actually work? Will this have an impact on emissions as our friends across the aisle seem to believe?

The answer is no. China is responsible for nearly one-third of all global emissions. As I said, they build more new coal-fired power plants than any other place on the planet. So China is responsible for nearly one-third of all global emissions, more than 2½ times the amount emitted by the United States.

When it comes to U.S. emissions, passenger vehicles are only a fraction of the total. In 2021, the entire transportation sector accounted for 28 percent of total greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. So if every car and every truck on the road was operated by an electric battery and electric vehicle courtesy of China, that would only account for 28 percent of the emissions. So this is not a solution to what our colleagues across the aisle are actually saying they are trying to do.

Transportation is a significant source of emissions, beating out electricity production, industry, and agriculture, but that doesn't mean that personal vehicles are responsible for 28 percent of the emissions, because you have to include cars, SUVs and minivans, and trucks that drive all across America. So regular working families driving their kids to school or to work account for a little over one-half of the transportation emissions. The remainder comes from semitrucks, airplanes, trains, buses, ships, pipelines. In total, personal vehicles account for a little over 16 percent, and the U.S. emissions account for only 12.5 percent of global emissions.

So we are not talking about a solution that our friends across the aisle say they want to accomplish. We are not going to eliminate our dependence on all of the above sources of energy, and we are certainly not going to solve what they perceive as a problem with the climate by forcing hardworking American families to subsidize electric cars for rich people.

My purpose in speaking today is to demonstrate that these goals set out for by the President and which our colleagues have voted for in pursuit of their climate agenda are unrealistic. They are dangerous, and they are shortsighted. We will continue to shine a bright light on the facts as I have tried to do today so the American people can understand exactly what is going on here. This is more a pursuit of an ideological agenda rather than a practical solution to the real problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF APRIL 30, 2023, THROUGH MAY 6, 2023, AS “NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK”

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today as chair of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee and on behalf of over 33 million small businesses across the country to recognize National Small Business Week.

When I complete my remarks, I am going to ask consent to pass S. Res. 200, which has been cleared from the hotline, which is sponsored by me, Senator ERNST, and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and a distinguished member of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, our current Presiding Officer, Senator BOOKER. This is a resolution that recognizes the contributions of small businesses and entrepreneurs in every community in the United States.

A lot has changed in the 60 years since the week was first celebrated in 1963, Small Business Week, but today, small businesses are as resilient as ever. They have faced immense challenges like COVID-19 and continue to serve their communities with great commitment and courage. Our small businesses deserve far more than a week of appreciation for all they do, but this week, we look forward to celebrating them and committing our full and unconditional support.

Small businesses account for 99.9 percent of all U.S. businesses and employ nearly half of all U.S. workers. They are spearheaded by entrepreneurs like Lois Gamerman, from my home State of Maryland, who was hit hard during the pandemic but who pulled her business through to continue serving our great State. Her grit and resourcefulness earned her the 2023 Maryland Small Business Person of the Year. I congratulate Lois on that accomplishment.

Lois saw an 85-percent loss in sales as the hospitality industry suffered during the pandemic. Her business, Soft Stuff Distributors, received help from the Small Business Administration's Paycheck Protection Program and the COVID-19 Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program to keep its doors open.

I thank all of my colleagues for their help in the passage of those two critically important bills—bipartisan efforts to keep our small businesses alive.

Lois is just one example of many small businesses that are alive today because of the efforts that we did here in the U.S. Senate. Now Soft Stuff occupies 33,000 square feet of space and employs over 50 individuals.

For Lois and the millions of entrepreneurs who depend on these resources, we must double down and continue to fund the programs that help fuel their success. The “Default on America Act” that Speaker MCCARTHY unveiled last week would do exactly the opposite. It would cause the small businesses we love and need, to suffer.

America needs to invest in our small businesses, not abandon them. If the “Default on America Act” were to become law, accessible capital for many entrepreneurs would diminish, and they would have nowhere to turn for assistance.

In 2022, the SBA's entrepreneurial development programs served 1.2 million small businesses. The “Default on America Act” proposes cutting spending to fiscal year 2022 levels. If spending for these critical programs is cut, the SBA would serve 125,000 fewer small businesses than in previous years; 125,000 American small businesses would be denied the resources and assistance that are critical to their survival.

While many small business owners would find themselves struggling without necessary resources, entrepreneurs of color, women, rural, and other underserved small business owners in particular would feel the squeeze.

Now is not the time to walk back our support. In fact, under the Biden-Harris administration, we have seen a small business boom. Today, there are more small business owners nationwide than ever, and now is the time to invest in them, to grow our economy from the middle out and the bottom-up, and to build on the small business boom.

We must come together to keep our communities strong, not push for legislation that would cut jobs and harm the local shops we love. Part of keeping our communities strong is by ensuring that the Agencies serving them work efficiently and effectively. The Small Business Administration does essential work in supporting small businesses and their communities.

For the sake of our small businesses, I ask my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together so we can pass the long-overdue reauthorization of the Small Business Administration. National Small Business Week is our chance to show our small businesses how valuable they are and to pledge our continued support.

To all of America's small businesses and entrepreneurs, thank you for what you do this week and every week.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 200, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 200) expressing support for the designation of the week of April 30, 2023, through May 6, 2023, as “National Small Business Week” to celebrate the contributions of small businesses and entrepreneurs in every community in the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered

made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 200) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

RECOGNIZING THE 202ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 42, S. Res. 119.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 119) recognizing the 202nd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARDIN. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 119) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 23, 2023, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 5, 2023, THROUGH TUESDAY, MAY 9, 2023

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned to convene for a pro forma session, with no business being conducted, at 9:30 a.m. on Friday, May 5; that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Tuesday, May 9; that on Tuesday, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Gorordo nomination; further, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 9.

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