

DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks Hirono Rosen
Baldwin Kaine Sanders
Bennet Kelly Schatz
Blumenthal Kim Schiff
Blum Rochester King Schumer
Booker Klobuchar Shaheen
Cantwell Lujan Smith
Coons Markey Van Hollen
Cortez Masto Merkley Warner
Durbin Murphy Warnock
Fetterman Murray Warren
Gallego Ossoff Welch
Gillibrand Padilla Whitehouse
Hassan Paul Wyden
Heinrich Peters
Hickenlooper Reed

NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth Justice Slotkin

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BRITT).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON BRADBURY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bradbury nomination?

Mr. TILLIS. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 113 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks Hirono Rosen
Baldwin Kaine Sanders
Bennet Kelly Schatz
Blumenthal Kim Schiff
Blum Rochester King Schumer
Booker Klobuchar Shaheen
Cantwell Lujan Smith
Coons Markey Van Hollen
Cortez Masto Merkley Warner
Durbin Murphy Warnock
Fetterman Murray Warren
Gallego Ossoff Welch
Gillibrand Padilla Whitehouse
Hassan Paul Wyden
Heinrich Peters
Hickenlooper Reed

NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth Justice Slotkin

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Slater nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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 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. 28, Abigail Slater, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

John Thune, Jim Justice, Bill Cassidy, Mike Rounds, Ted Budd, Tom Cotton, Jon Husted, Tim Sheehy, Deb Fischer, Ron Johnson, John Kennedy, Markwayne Mullin, Steve Daines, Ashley Moody, Ted Cruz, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Eric Schmitt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Abigail Slater, of the District of Co-

lumbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, 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. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 114 Ex.]

YEAS—77

Alsobrooks Gallego Murkowski
Baldwin Graham Padilla
Banks Grassley Peters
Barrasso Hagerty Ricketts
Bennet Hassan Risch
Blackburn Hickenlooper Rosen
Booker Hoeven Rounds
Boozman Husted Schiff
Britt Hyde-Smith Schmitt
Budd Johnson Scott (FL)
Cantwell Kaine Scott (SC)
Capito Kelly Shaheen
Cassidy Kennedy Sheehy
Collins Kim Smith
Coons King Sullivan
Cornyn Klobuchar Thune
Cortez Masto Lankford Tillis
Cotton Lee Tuberville
Cramer Lummis Marshall
Crapo Marshall Warnock
Cruz McConnell Warren
Curtis McCormick Welch
Daines Moody Whitehouse
Durbin Moran Wicker
Ernst Moreno Wyden
Fischer Mullin Young

NAYS—19

Blumenthal Markey Sanders
Blum Rochester Merkley Schatz
Fetterman Murphy Schumer
Gillibrand Murray Van Hollen
Heinrich Ossoff Warner
Hirono Paul
Lujan Reed

NOT VOTING—4

Duckworth Justice
Hawley Slotkin

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 77, the nays are 19.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Abigail Slater, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, if House Republicans don't think they need us when writing a bill, why should they expect us to support that bill, especially when it comes to taking funding away from our families who depend on it and hurting our communities and giving away Congress's power over key funding decisions?

Instead of working with Democrats to invest in working people all across our country and make sure our constituents have their voices heard in

government funding, Speaker JOHNSON abandoned talks and rolled out a bill that includes major cuts. It cuts non-defense discretionary funding by \$15 billion in total in 2025 and hands a blank check to Trump and Elon Musk to pick winners and losers and steal from our constituents.

Make no mistake, the entire bill the House is voting on today is House Republicans' own doing, and it is a dumpster fire, so I am here to sound the alarm about that fire before it spreads. But, first, I need everyone to understand: The choice is absolutely not dumpster fire or shutdown. I should know. I introduced another option yesterday. It is a short-term CR that would give us the time to finish doing our job and negotiate bipartisan, full-year bills. There is no reason we cannot do that, and there is every reason that every single one of us should prefer actual bills that we write to help people over the bill that just empowers two billionaires who are running our government into the ground and our economy into a recession.

I really want to make sure all of my colleagues understand how bad this bill is. So if anyone thinks this bill from House Republicans is going to avoid chaos or avoid pain for our country, listen up because it is only going to add to the chaos.

This is not a "clean CR," as some Republicans claim. It cuts programs our communities rely on, and that includes a major 44-percent cut to Army Corps projects that help mitigate against floods and hurricanes and much else.

It cuts medical research into diseases and conditions affecting servicemembers and their families by more than \$1 billion. That is over 40 percent.

It leaves a massive \$280 million shortfall in NIH's budget, and that is a big cut to research that saves lives.

It leaves a shortfall for housing programs. We are talking about 32,000 fewer vouchers. And that is just scratching the surface.

It also completely lacks the basic guardrails we include in all of our funding bills, on a bipartisan basis, each and every year, to make sure that our States and our communities are taken care of and not just subject to the whims of the Trump administration or any administration to pick winners and losers.

House Republicans are not trying to responsibly fund the government; they are trying to turn it into a slush fund for Trump and Musk to wield as they see fit so that they can shift their focus entirely to tax cuts for billionaires.

Right now, we—Congress—have the power of the purse. We have that power to fight for our States, to fight for our families, to bring Federal dollars back home and build bridges and feed families and care for veterans and fight fentanyl—whatever our communities tell us they need.

We should not cede that power with this bill. That is really worth sitting with for a minute.

We all chose to be here, to be here in Congress. We chose to take on this role so we can advocate for causes and communities that we care about and work in a bipartisan manner to reach compromise, to make sure that our causes and our communities get the support they need.

House Republicans' full-year CR would instead pass the buck to Elon Musk and unelected political appointees to decide who gets funded and who doesn't. Is that not why each and every one of us was actually elected, to fight for our States and to fight for our communities as the people who know them best?

I certainly know that is true for me. I have worked for years with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make sure that people back home who trusted us when we said we would fight for them always know Congress has their back.

So really think about that before you vote to make your voice mean less for the rest of this fiscal year because it is terrifying to think of what unelected political appointees would do.

We have already gotten an alarming preview of how Trump will threaten to cut off States and cities that might disagree with him, and Elon will totally work the government to benefit his companies and hurt his competitors.

I have to say, our bipartisan appropriations process is not always easy, but it is a heck of a lot better than handing over our decision making to this or to any administration. Voting against this bill is about standing for communities and families who actually rely on the funding and for our ability—every one of us—to be a voice for our constituents in Congress because what is going to happen when, perhaps, medical research funding gets sucked away from cancer and Alzheimer's all because a scientist worked somewhere previously and said that vaccines are safe and all of a sudden the funding is gone?

What happens when you can't get a bridge replaced because the political appointees at DOT don't like the policies your mayors advocated for?

What happens when they reduce staffing at national parks in your backyard because your Governor won't deny climate change?

The bipartisan directives we provide—we, Congress, provides—each year with our funding bills help guard against that kind of thing for any administration. And all of that is missing from this disastrous slush fund CR.

Through bipartisan compromise, we make sure our communities have a voice at the table, and our taxpayer dollars have a return on their taxes. We should reject this bill. We should pass a short-term CR to avoid a shutdown, and then we should do our job and work on full-year spending bills like we were sent here to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am scheduled to be part of a colloquy here in just a couple minutes, but I wanted to make a comment about what the Senator from Washington has shared.

I am going to use a term that maybe some people are not familiar with. We are in a "Morton's fork"—a Morton's fork. We have heard about a fork in the road. Some people know what a Hobson's choice is. But a Morton's fork is a choice between two equally unpleasant alternatives. And if this isn't where we are right now, ladies and gentlemen, I don't know what is.

As Senator MURRAY has outlined, a long-term CR—a long-term CR—when we have already done our appropriations work and we are not able to get to that work and instead we basically give the administration the ability to direct within the funding levels but direct as they will see fit through the end of September is something that I think many of us—certainly this appropriator—do not really feel comfortable with.

I spent a lot of time within my Appropriations subcommittee, working very hard with the Department of the Interior, to make sure that we knew, whether it was funding for wildland firefighters or what we were doing within the VA or within any of the other Agencies—that we did what people asked and expected us to do. We did those bills, and I think we did a pretty good job.

Mine moved out of full committee unanimously, and then they didn't advance. So here we are sitting at a place where we have to take either the choice of a long-term CR and basically give up the work that we have done as a Congress or we move to a government shutdown, an equally untenable and equally unpleasant alternative and one that, quite honestly, we should not be in this position. We should not be in this place where we have two bad choices for our government and for the people of this country.

We can do better. I wish—I agree, Senator MURRAY—I wish that what we were able to advance was a short-term CR that would allow us to move to finish up our appropriations bills, do our work, and then start moving on to fiscal year 2026. I don't know whether it is possible between now and the end of day on March 14, but I, for one, am at a place where I am just beside myself that we are in a place where we feel that we have no good alternatives. We are in a Morton's fork.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

UKRAINE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to come to the floor today to support Ukraine. I am especially pleased that we have colleagues from both sides of the aisle who are here to support the Ukrainians in this unjust war against Russia.