The Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, Mark Lowcock, warned that this famine could become ''the largest famine the world has seen for many decades, with millions of victims.''

Every day, about 130 children die from hunger and disease. We pride ourselves on going to the assistance in the world when children are being slaughtered or starved or decimated by disease. In this case, we are participating in this carnage. Does any Member of this Senate want to stand up and say that is an appropriate mission for the United States to participate in, this carnage? I certainly hope not.

The death and destruction in Yemen is unimaginable. It is appropriate that we debate on the floor the Sanders-Lee-Murphy resolution, a bipartisan resolution to say: Let's honor the Constitution. Let's abide by the 1973 War Powers Act. Let's hold the administration accountable because it is not just this issue—although this issue is massive—it is also the standard by which the Executive will operate in every potential war theater around the world for a decade to come.

If we proceed to say that it is OK that you trample the Constitution in Yemen, that you disregard the War Powers Resolution in Yemen, then we will be giving carte blanche to this administration to do so in one nation after another. We have long abdicated our responsibility. Let's abdicate no more. Play the role, the responsibility the Founding Fathers gave us in the Constitution, and bring an end to our participation without authorization in this horrific conflict.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

S.J. RES. 54—MOTION TO DISCHARGE—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

JUDICIAL VACANCIES

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, 1 year ago today, the Senate Judiciary Committee opened its hearing on the nomination of Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch. The Stanford Law & Policy Review has now published my article on one of the opposition's arguments made in that hearing and sure to be repeated should President Trump have the opportunity to make another Supreme Court nomination.

Today, I want to look at the lower courts because no fewer than 138 positions on the Federal district and appeals courts are vacant. That does not include 33 vacancies that we already know will occur in the next year or so. Everyone must understand both the seriousness and the cause of this crisis.

By itself, 138 is just a number. It is a big number, but it needs a frame of reference or a standard for us to know whether this number of judicial vacancies is normal or a serious problem that has to be addressed. I certainly don't want to be accused of partisanship, so I will rely solely on the standards and criteria used in the past by my Democratic colleagues. Let's first use some Democratic standards to evaluate the number of judicial vacancies that we face today.

One standard is that the Democrats have specifically identified how many vacancies are unacceptable. In February 2000, with a Democrat in the White House, the Democrats said that 79 vacancies were ''too high.'' In September 2012, with the Democrats both in the White House and controlling the Senate, they declared a ''judicial vacancy crisis'' when there were 78 vacancies.

If 78 vacancies is a crisis, what is the label for 138 vacancies? This is the highest judicial vacancy total since September 1991, but more than half of those vacancies were fresh from Congress's having created new judgeships several months earlier. So I think it is fair to say that in either total or percentage terms, we face today the most serious judicial vacancy crisis that anyone in this body has ever seen.

A second Democratic vacancy standard is that, as they did in April 2014, we can compare judicial vacancies today with vacancies at the same point under previous Presidents. If that Democratic standard is valid, vacancies today are 35 percent higher than at this point under President Obama and 46 percent higher than at this point under President George W. Bush.

There is a third Democratic vacancy standard. In June 2013 and at least as far back as April 1999, the Democrats have complained that the Senate was not confirming enough judicial nominees to keep up with normal attrition. Well, judicial vacancies today are 30 percent higher than when President Trump took office, and, as I said, at least 33 more have already been announced.

Finally, the Democrats have frequently said that the 107th Congress—the first 2 years of the George W. Bush administration—should be our judicial confirmation benchmark. During that time, the Senate confirmed an average of just over four judicial nominees per month. The Senate has so far confirmed 28 of President Trump's district and appeals court nominees or fewer than two per month.

Take your pick. By any or all of these Democratic standards, we face a much more serious judicial vacancy crisis than in years past. In addition to the gravity of this crisis, however, the American people need to know its cause. I can tell you what is not causing this vacancy crisis. President Trump started making nominations to the Federal district and appeals courts on March 21, 2017, just 61 days after taking office, as you can see on this chart. By August of last year, he had made more than three times as many judicial nominations as the average for his five predecessors of both parties. President Trump has nominated 86 men and women to the Federal bench since he took office 14 months ago.

If the President is making so many nominations, perhaps the problem lies somewhere in the Senate confirmation process. Once again, my Democratic colleagues can help figure this out. In November 2013, then-Judiciary Committee Chairman PATRICK LEAHY spoke about obstructing judicial nominees ''in other ways that the public is less aware.'' The Democrats are using such below-the-public-radar obstruction tactics at each stage of the confirmation process.

The first stop in the confirmation process is the Senate Judiciary Committee. Under Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY's leadership, the committee has held a hearing for 62 of President Trump's judicial nominees—more than under any of the previous five Presidents at this point. So that is clearly not the problem. The first sign of Democratic obstruction is the unwarranted and partisan opposition to reporting judicial nominations from the Judiciary Committee.

In February 2012, 3 years into the Obama administration, the Democrats complained that five nominees to the U.S. district court had been reported by the Judiciary Committee on a party-line vote. This, they said, departed dramatically from Senate tradition. Today, just 14 months into the Trump administration, eight nominees to the U.S. district court have been reported by the Judiciary Committee on a party-line vote. The present rate of such party-line votes in the Judiciary Committee is more than four times what the Democrats criticized just a few years ago.

The below-the-radar obstruction tactics continue when the Judiciary Committee sends judicial nominees to the full Senate. The Democrats, for example, refuse to cooperate in scheduling confirmation votes. They can't prevent confirmation votes altogether because they abolished nomination filibusters in 2013, but if they can't make judicial confirmations impossible, they are determined to make them very difficult. Here is how they do it.

The Senate must end debate on a nomination before it can vote on confirmation. The majority and minority have traditionally cooperated to end debate and set up confirmation votes. In March 2014, not for the first time, the Democrats said that refusing consent to schedule votes on pending nominees was obstruction. When the minority refuses that consent, the only way to end debate and set up a confirmation vote is by the formal cloture