

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Banks	Grassley	Moreno
Barrasso	Hagerty	Mullin
Bennet	Hassan	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Reed
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Cassidy	Johnson	Rounds
Collins	Justice	Schmitt
Coons	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cramer	King	Sheehy
Crapo	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Curtis	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Warner
Fischer	McConnell	Warnock
Gallego	Moody	Wicker
Graham	Moran	Young

NAYS—32

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Schatz
Baldwin	Kim	Schiff
Blumenthal	Lujan	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Markey	Slotkin
Booker	Merkley	Smith
Cantwell	Murphy	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—2

Duckworth	McCormick
-----------	-----------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be notified of the Senate's actions.

The majority leader.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Huckabee nomination.

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 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. 67, Mike Huckabee, of Arkansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Israel.

John Thune, John Barrasso, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John R. Curtis, Rick Scott of Florida, Bernie Moreno, Pete Ricketts, Eric Schmitt, Jon A. Husted, Roger Marshall, Jim Justice, Tommy Tuberville, Bill Hagerty, Joni Ernst, James E. Risch, Marsha Blackburn, Tim Sheehy.

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 Mike Huckabee, of Arkansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Israel, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

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 Pennsylvania (Mr. McCORMICK).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 196 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—1

McCormick

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mike Huckabee, of Arkansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 4:30 p.m., the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Hoekstra nomination; further, that at 6 p.m., the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Johnson and Cabrera nominations in the order listed and that if cloture is invoked on the nominations individually, the postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on the confirma-

tions of the nominations as well as the motion to invoke cloture on the Atkins nomination at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, no earlier than Wednesday, April 9; finally, that if the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. I also ask that the order be amended to include the Huckabee nomination.

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

TARIFFS

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, this morning, we had a Finance Committee meeting, and Ambassador Greer was there, our U.S. Trade Representative, whom I voted for and have a lot of confidence in. I asked him a line of questions. Then I saw the press getting lazy and not reporting what I said. So I felt like, instead of having to talk a lot to the press, here is what I said:

I was a partner at Price Waterhouse for most of my career. I have advised big clients on big projects. What I was asking the Ambassador today was a simple question on policy—or, I should say, on business—that didn't resonate with the people in journalism who have, apparently, never worked a day in business. We used to have this concept of "one throat to choke," right? When somebody makes a business decision for a major enterprise, there is always one person—it is not the President; it is not the Vice President, as they are in elected positions, and they have to roll out experts.

All I was saying there is I support what is going on, right now, with trade. As uncertain as it may seem now, I think the President is right in challenging other nations that have, for decades, abused their relationship with the United States—to press. I think he should. Whether or not I would do it "alla prima," as I described—that is all at once—or whether or not I would pick out the top quartile of the worst offenders, work on them, and then kind of work down the list is subject to debate.

But the point that I was making is that someone in the administration—I assume, when they decided to do broad-based tariffs against dozens and dozens of countries, that they gamed out the second- and third-order effects of that decision. I am assuming that anybody with a modicum of business experience would have understood that the markets are going to react the way they did, and that is OK. Markets go up and down. Markets reacting the way they have over the past few days over the long term is a problem.

So my request—just to make it clear what I said—of "one throat to choke" is just in jest: Whom is it I am either going to put on a pedestal and show up at the ticker-tape parades when all this stuff works out well or whom am I going to hold accountable for not thinking through some of the second-

and third-order effects? That is what businesspeople do, and that is what I did for the majority of my career. Presumably, with the very successful businesspeople consulting President Trump, they have thought it through.

We need to know that because the American people are wondering. I have got farmers—and the Congress has failed to pass a farm bill for a few years now. So I have got farmers living harvest to harvest, and now we are being told that there may be some nontariff trade barriers shutting down markets. So I will hear from my pork farmers and I will hear from soybean farmers and I will hear from cotton farmers and I will hear from people who grow about 80 different commodities at scale. We are one of the No. 1 pork States, and we are one of the No. 1 chicken States. They need certainty. I am willing to have some of this happen, but at some point, we have to settle it down and sooner rather than later.

The only other thing I said that, I think, bears repeating is that businesspeople do think in long terms. Most of the business cases I have built for clients were for 5-year, 10-year, 15-year sort of horizons. You don't have that luxury in business. If you get the country on the right track or the wrong track, you suffer the political consequences or the benefit every 2 years. So anybody who tells me this trade stuff is going to be tumultuous for a couple of years does not understand American democracy. Americans give you about 14 months after January when you get sworn in to demonstrate that you are putting the country on the right track. If you do, you get rewarded at the ballot box, and if you don't, you get sent home.

So the only thing that I was trying to communicate today is I hope and I believe that there are people in the White House who are protecting the President by looking around corners and implementing policies that are going to benefit the American people. If they did, then this should work out really well. If they didn't, they should be that "throat."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Senator has left the floor, but to follow up on the comments of the Senator of North Carolina, I would just say that we should all be reminded of the fact that half of the people in America do not know that their futures lie in the Dow Jones average. They may not own stock or they may own it in a retirement account and not follow the stock market on a day-to-day basis. What they do worry about is whether or not they have enough money for groceries and gasoline for the car, to pay the rent or the mortgage, and perhaps to sock away a little money for the educations of their kids. Those are the fundamentals.

I think many of them are concerned, as I am, that the volatility of our economy, at this point, does not point in

the right direction. It raises a question as to whether or not decisions are being made, particularly on tariffs, that are going to have an impact on ordinary working American families—a negative impact on that basis. I think that we all want to be sensitized to that fact.

You can watch CNBC, and you can commune with the economists of note, but for most people, it is pretty basic: Do I have enough money to get to the next paycheck? A lot of people struggle with that every single day. That is the reality that we are faced with.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. President, I am here to discuss another subject. It is one that you hope you will never have to think about on a personal basis, but you know the possibility is always there.

America is a nation of pride, of resilience, of grit, but of all else, we are a nation of hope. Vaclav Havel—a Czech statesman and poet—once said:

Hope is not the conviction that something will turn out well . . . but the certainty that something makes sense, regardless of how it turns out.

This, to me, is the essence of medical research. There are few guarantees when it comes to medical research. There is no assurance that any single clinical trial will reveal the best treatment option; that one experiment will lead to a groundbreaking discovery; that one promising grant application will result in a breakthrough cure.

But there is certainty in funding medical research; certainty in knowing that, while not all trials, experiments, and grants will result in a breakthrough, some of them will. Because of medical research, kids with a simple ear infection and pneumonia can find relief with antibiotics. Because of medical research, we have vaccines that have saved tens of millions of lives worldwide. Because of medical research, we have anesthesia to allow patients to safely undergo major surgery. Because of medical research, people are surviving heart attacks, beating cancer, living with HIV/AIDS, receiving organ donations, surviving drug overdoses, and living longer.

There is a lot more to be done. So many people are still hoping and praying for more: the wife hoping for treatment that will slow down or stop her husband's ALS; the father or mother hoping for a cure that saves the life of their child with glioblastoma brain cancer; the son or daughter hoping for medication that helps their mom, suffering from Alzheimer's, to remember who she is.

Do you know who offers that hope? The National Institutes of Health. It is our Nation's premier biomedical research Agency. It is considered the gold standard around the world.

For decades, NIH has been a bipartisan success story, with Congress privatizing the funding of promising lifesaving medical research in all 50 States; prioritizing, creating, and supporting good-paying jobs in red, blue,

and purple States; and offering real hope to families who are desperate for it.

Consider this: 99 percent of all drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration between 2010 and 2019 were developed with NIH funding—99 percent. Have you seen all of those ads on television about breakthrough drugs? Ninety-nine percent of them started with the government Agency known as the National Institutes of Health.

NIH means new cures and treatments. It is that simple. Yet we find ourselves today at a point of decision on the future of medical research in America.

President Trump and his billionaire buddy Elon Musk and our Nation's health Secretary have decided to take a sledge hammer to NIH and medical research writ large. They have illegally cut off funding for medical research around the country, terminated clinical trials in progress, placed gag orders on researchers, and fired more than a thousand NIH employees. Think of that—a thousand NIH employees have been fired by this administration.

Instead of bolstering medical research, they are breaking it. Instead of offering hope to patients in need, unfortunately, they are crushing it.

Donald Trump, Elon Musk, and RFK, Jr., are either completely oblivious to what they are doing, or they just don't care.

But do you know who isn't oblivious? Many of my Republican colleagues, many of whom who fought by my side to increase the NIH budget by 60 percent over the past decade. This was a bipartisan effort over the last 10 years.

Roy Blunt, a conservative Republican Senator from Missouri, was leading the effort most of the time because he was the subcommittee chairman in Appropriations for NIH. In addition to him were Lamar Alexander—a thoughtful, conservative Republican from Tennessee—and PATTY MURRAY. We were the team, the four of us. We just kept reminding people year after year, budget after budget that medical research would pay off and do so if we committed ourselves to it. And it worked.

Many of my colleagues on the Republican side came to understand that and gave us their support as well, which is why their silence now—their refusal to say anything or to act—in the face of President Trump's dismantling of NIH is just so devastating.

This is a truly bipartisan issue, medical research. We ought to step up and say to this administration or any administration: For God's sake, don't cut back on medical research. You know the price we will pay in the years to come.

If Republican Senators won't stand up for NIH funding in their United States, for constituents in their States, I am going to do it.

I plan to come to the Senate floor in the coming weeks to talk about the importance of medical research and NIH funding, even in red States across the