

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

country. Today, I would start with the State of South Dakota, home of the Senate majority leader.

In 2024, South Dakota research institutions received nearly \$29 million in NIH funding, which supported 453 jobs in South Dakota.

Sanford Research/University of South Dakota and South Dakota State University were among some of the top NIH-funded institutions in South Dakota. So what did they do with this Federal money? Could they survive an audit if they had to explain how they spent it? You decide.

Sanford Research/University of South Dakota researchers used NIH funding to support their Center for Pediatric Research, with a specific focus on training new scientists to study pediatric diseases. Is that a priority? If it is your child or grandchild, you bet it is.

South Dakota State University used NIH funding to increase cervical cancer screening among indigenous women who faced higher rates of cervical cancer prevalence and death. They also used funding in South Dakota to develop new targeted therapies for colorectal cancer. They are safer and more effective than current chemotherapy.

These researchers know that cuts to medical research mean diseases will not be cured and treatments will not be found. They know the mass indiscriminate firings at NIH don't just mean we are losing talent; it also means we are losing time and progress.

Nelson Mandela once said:

May your choices reflect your hopes, not your fears.

I am pleading with my Republican colleagues: May your choices reflect your hopes for new cures and treatments for patients fighting cancer, ALS, Alzheimer's, and heart disease; not your fears about what will happen if you cross this President.

Let us do what is right. Let's come together again on a bipartisan basis for medical research. Let's make it clear to this President and every President, regardless of party: Medical research is not partisan. Medical research helps all people—conservatives, progressives, you name it. Everybody gets a helping hand.

Let us do what is right. Let's come together and save medical research for every single person in America who is desperate for hope.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. BUDD assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from Kentucky.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. PAUL. I ask consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Hoekstra 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. 55, Peter Hoekstra, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

John Thune, Pete Ricketts, Katie Boyd Britt, Markwayne Mullin, Jim Justice, Ted Budd, Jim Banks, Mike Crapo, John Hoeven, Bill Hagerty, Mike Rounds, Josh Hawley, Todd Young, Bernie Moreno, Cindy Hyde-Smith, James E. Risch, John Barrasso.

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 Peter Hoekstra, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada, 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 197 Ex.]

YEAS—60

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

NAYS—37

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

NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Justice	McCormick
-----------	---------	-----------

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter Hoekstra, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I saw something last week that I didn't believe. I read the article, and then I searched the internet for other articles saying the same thing to confirm that it was true, and it was true. I am still in disbelief.

The largest public school system in America is in New York City. I love New York City. I think it is the greatest city in the world. And the New York public schools publish a monthly newsletter. It is called—let's see what it is called—the Office of Student Pathways Newsletter. Every month, the public school system in New York City sends this newsletter. They blast it out to teachers, and they blast it out to parents—not just in New York City but all across the country.

In the latest newsletter they blasted out, they had one of those bullet points that they made in the newsletter that is kind of—when you look at it on the internet, it is kind of pale blue. You can click on it, and it sends you to another site.

The bullet point on the newsletter that the public schools of New York sent out was called “Guidelines for teaching about genocide.” “Guidelines for teaching about genocide.” And if you clicked on this phrase in the newsletter, it sent you to another site. Do you see what the site was? “Stop Gaza Genocide Toolkit.” “Stop Gaza Genocide Toolkit.” The administration of the New York public schools, the largest in the country, is sending this out to its teachers and its students and to the world.

If you take a look and you say “What is in this toolkit, this ‘Stop Gaza Genocide Toolkit’?” it contains the biggest bunch of anti-Semitic rot you can imagine. The toolkit, among other things, breaks down how to mobilize pro-Palestinian campaigns on social media. It tells you—it tells our students and our teachers how to boycott and encourage divestment from pro-Israel organizations. It encourages readers to print out “Palestine” yard signs and calls our kids and our parents to action.

Now, the head of the public schools in New York was embarrassed once people started going: What is going on? Why are you publishing this anti-Semitic, anti-systemic rot accusing Israel of genocide, after it was Israel that was attacked, after it was Hamas that started the war? The chancellor, Ms. Melissa Aviles-Ramos, said it was just a “troubling oversight.” That is what she said: “troubling oversight.”