

The provision to clarify the regulation of vessel incidental discharge delivered a much needed victory for the communities and small maritime businesses, including so many in my State of Kentucky, that rely on America's inland waterways for their livelihood. The reauthorization delivered some well-earned certainty to the brave men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard, whose commitment to service should make all of us proud.

Of course, the Coast Guard legislation was just the very latest installment in a long list of bipartisan successes passed by this Senate in this Congress on behalf of the American people.

The big battles may be what captivate the press, and Republicans are certainly proud of our signature accomplishments, like historic tax reform and confirming Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh, but at the same time, it is frequently overlooked how many of this Congress's achievements have been thoroughly bipartisan.

Republicans and Democrats together passed landmark legislation that marshaled more resources to the frontlines of communities fighting against opioids, more specialized training and resources for first responders, greater access to grant support for State and local authorities, and more support for treatment, recovery, and workforce reentry programs to heal the wounds of this devastating epidemic.

Together we reformed some of the excesses of Dodd-Frank and lightened the load on local lenders.

Together we ended the cycle of chronic continuing resolutions for defense funding that denied certainty to our Armed Forces and eroded our readiness. We rebuilt a regular appropriations process. It featured the largest year-on-year defense funding increase in 15 years and the biggest pay raise for servicemembers in nearly a decade.

Together we made new investments to start rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure.

Together, we brought new resources and new reforms to the systems that serve our veterans. Together, we improved comprehensive sanctions to target maligned behavior throughout the international system. We passed major bills to combat sex trafficking, improve school safety, expand opportunities for vocational and technical training, and extend the right to try new medical treatments to those with terminal illnesses.

This isn't even an exhaustive list. Clearly, the Senate has proved to be fertile soil for bipartisan work. It has made life better for the American people in tangible ways. We should all take pride in this, and we need to keep up this momentum for the remainder of this year as we consider more legislation and confirm more nominees. We will need it throughout the next Congress. We will need to work across the aisle within this body, and this Repub-

lican Senate and Democratic House will need to learn to collaborate as well. This long list of accomplishments offers just the blueprint we will need.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES.

65

Mr. PAUL. Pursuant to the Arms Export Act of 1976, I move to discharge the Foreign Relations Committee from further consideration of S.J. Res. 65, relating to the disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Bahrain.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is now pending.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that until 12:15 p.m., the time be equally divided by opponents and proponents, with the first 30 minutes for opponents of the bill and the last 30 minutes for proponents of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

SPECIAL COUNSEL INVESTIGATION

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise to discuss the firing of Attorney General Jeff Sessions by President Trump immediately after the midterm elections, as well as the ongoing Justice Department investigation by Special Counsel Robert Mueller into Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. Presidential elections.

The only transparency to be found in the Trump White House is the President's disdain for the Mueller investigation into the 2016 elections. After multiple guilty pleas and convictions among the President's campaign advisers on this ongoing investigation, President Trump remains relentless in his campaign to find any way possible to limit the scope of the ongoing investigation.

I did not support Jeff Sessions' nomination to be Attorney General, but he followed the law and rightly recused himself from overseeing the work of Mr. Mueller and his team of professional investigators. Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein should continue to oversee the Mueller investigation. Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein has shown his fidelity to the rule of law with the much needed announce-

ment of a special counsel to investigate potential criminal activity and collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russian Government in the 2016 elections. His choice of Robert Mueller was solid. Mr. Mueller served as the FBI Director under both Democratic and Republican Presidential administrations. He has a well-earned reputation as a nonpartisan professional.

Let me remind my colleagues that when Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein made the special counsel appointment in May of 2017, he wrote:

I determined that it is in the public interest for me to exercise my authority and appoint a Special Counsel to assume responsibility for this matter. . . . What I have determined is that based upon the unique circumstances, the public interest requires me to place this investigation under the authority of a person who exercises a degree of independence from the normal chain of command. . . . Considering the unique circumstances of this matter, however, I determined that a Special Counsel is necessary in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome. Our Nation is grounded on the rule of law, and the public must be assured that government officials administer the law fairly. Special Counsel Mueller will have all appropriate resources to conduct a thorough and complete investigation, and I am confident that he will follow the facts, apply the law and reach a just result.

That is what Mr. Rosenstein said when he appointed Mr. Mueller as special counsel. Now we know just how right Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein was to worry about protecting the independence and integrity of the special counsel's investigation so that the rule of law would be followed and the special counsel could follow the facts, apply the law, and reach a just result regardless of what the President wants. Indeed, at every turn, President Trump has tried to undermine the rule of law and interfere with this investigation. He has relentlessly criticized the Mueller investigation in the court of public opinion, somehow characterizing it as a "witch-hunt" by conflicted, "angry Democrats," notwithstanding the dozens of guilty pleas and convictions already obtained by the special counsel, as well as Mr. Mueller's professional, nonpartisan legacy of service.

The new Acting Attorney General, Matthew Whitaker, who is an unconfirmed political appointee, is already on the record making inflammatory comments on how to limit the scope of the investigation and cut off resources. He should immediately recuse himself from the investigation. Serious legal questions have been raised about the legality and constitutionality of the designation by President Trump of Mr. Whitaker, who has not been confirmed by the Senate and is heading a Cabinet Department. The Constitution's appointment clause requires all principal officers of the government to be nominated and have the advice and consent of the Senate.

This action by President Trump imperils the very leadership of the Justice Department and its day-to-day operations and calls into question any decisions made by Mr. Whitaker during his temporary service. The Senate already confirmed Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein on an overwhelming bipartisan basis, by a 94-to-6 vote, in April of 2017. Under Justice Department guidance and current law, Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein, who has served with distinction under both Democratic and Republican administrations and was nominated by President Trump, should be designated as the Acting Attorney General until such time as the President nominates and the Senate confirms a successor to former Attorney General Sessions.

Under the current oversight of Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein, Special Counsel Mueller's investigation must continue until its conclusion. The President must stop trying to impede its progress. Congress has a responsibility to finally take legislative action to protect the investigation from meddling by the White House, especially from interference by the President.

The Senate has an obligation to pass legislation that would ensure the independence of the special counsel, provide judicial review for the removal of the special counsel, and require additional reporting to Congress and the American people on the special counsel's investigations, documents, and ultimate findings. S. 2644 does exactly that and is a bipartisan bill that passed the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 14 to 7 in April of 2018. It has sat on the Senate's calendar for more than 6 months. The full Senate should be able to vote on this measure immediately given the active and ongoing interference by President Trump into the special counsel's investigation.

I hope my colleagues agree that the special counsel should be allowed to finish his work without interference. No one under the Constitution—not even the President—is above the law, and Congress cannot allow the President to obstruct the special counsel's investigation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to share with the Senate and those following this debate a story about a man named Alton Mills.

Alton Mills was a young African American in the city of Chicago. He was an above-average high school student. It looked like he might even go on to higher education, but he had

some bad luck when it came to employment and jobs, and he made a stupid decision. He made a stupid decision by becoming part of a gang in the neighborhood that was selling drugs.

As a result of that, he was arrested and convicted of the possession and sale of a small amount of narcotics. The sentence was suspended because he had had no previous criminal record.

It happened a second time. Again, he didn't serve a day in jail. It was suspended with the promise that he would never do it again, but he stumbled and did it a third time. As a result of that, in 1994, at the age of 24, Alton Mills was given a mandatory sentence of life in prison. He had never been involved in a violent crime. He had never used a firearm, and he never was a drug kingpin but had been involved in the sale of drugs. At the age of 24, he received a life sentence for the three incidents I just mentioned.

How could we have ever reached a point at which a person would be sent to jail for life for those three crimes?

We reached that point because 25 years ago we did something that was just plain wrong. You will seldom hear a Senator say this in the course of a speech, but I am going to say it. The worst vote I ever cast in my life in the House or in the Senate was for the 100-to-1 sentencing disparity between crack cocaine and powder cocaine. In other words, if you took the same amount of cocaine and if it were in a powder form, sitting next to the same amount of cocaine in a crystallized form that could be smoked and if you were arrested for the possession of one or the other, the sentence for crack cocaine was 100 times what it was for powder cocaine.

Why did we do that? Why did we have such a gross disparity? It was because we were frightened.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I remember it well. They came to us and said that there was a new form of cocaine on the streets. It cost 5 bucks, and it was heavily addictive. If a mother were to ingest this cocaine while being pregnant, it could harm the fetus for life. So do something.

At about that same time, there was this great scandal here in Washington, DC, of an outstanding basketball player at the University of Maryland, named Len Bias, who overdosed on drugs and died. People were talking about his career in the NBA and this great talent, and he was dead. It had nothing to do with crack cocaine, but it was part of the environment and part of the overreaction that took place among politicians in Washington. I was one of them. I voted for that 100-to-1 disparity and said we had to accept a hard, tough message right now. We did—100 to 1.

It didn't have any measurable impact on drug sales in the United States, but it had a measurable impact on the number of people who were incarcerated in the United States and the

lengths of their incarcerations. Those votes that I and many like me cast on both sides of the aisle resulted in mandatory sentences for people like Alton Mills—life sentences. Let me tell you how the Alton Mills story ends before I go on.

After serving 24 years in prison for those three street sales, Alton Mills came to my attention through a criminal defense attorney named—of all things—MiAngel Cody. She was Alton's angel. That is for sure. She fought for him, and she believed that he deserved better than to spend the rest of his life rotting in prison for those stupid decisions he made in his early life. I appealed to President Obama to commute his sentence, and the President agreed to do that. So, after all of that service behind bars, Alton Mills was released.

What is he doing today?

He is a mechanic at the Chicago Transit Authority. He repairs the buses that I ride on. He got married. He is now working with his daughter and his new grandchild. He is contributing to society. He is a community college student, where he is pursuing an associate's degree. Finally, his life is on the right track. If he had not received a pardon, Alton Mills would have died in prison because of our existing Federal sentencing laws.

Yesterday, something happened which is remarkable. President Donald Trump had a press conference with representatives of law enforcement and announced that he was going to support legislation, which I have been working on for quite some time with Senator LEE and Senator GRASSLEY, to change the sentencing provisions that I have described to you. What an amazing coalition—DURBIN on the Democratic side, GRASSLEY and LEE on the Republican side, and now President Trump. The stars are lined up in a way that we seldom see in Washington, DC.

What we are going to set out to do with this bill, if we can pass it in the closing weeks of this session, is to give a chance to thousands of people who are still serving sentences for non-violent offenses involving crack cocaine under the old 100-to-1 ruling to petition individually, not as a group, to the court for a reduction in the sentencing.

I have been through this. It is not easy. They have to go right back to the U.S. Attorney's Office that prosecuted them to get the thumbs up and approval to go forward. Many times, they turn to victims, if there are victims in the crime, before any decision is made. They turn to the judges, particularly those sentencing judges who are still on the bench. If they clear all of those hurdles, they have a chance for reductions in their sentences.

Senator GRASSLEY and I are about to introduce legislation that President Trump endorsed yesterday, and we will begin working to build bipartisan support to pass it before we leave. Congress needs to pass this legislation. We have a different drug crisis facing us

today. It isn't crack cocaine anymore. It is an opioid epidemic. It is a Federal epidemic. It is the deadliest drug epidemic that we have ever faced.

We have a totally different view of drugs than we did when Alton Mills was sentenced. In those days, most of the defendants were people of color—primarily African Americans. Yet today this opioid epidemic has gone far beyond the hood. It has gone far beyond the inner city. It affects suburbs, even the wealthiest of suburbs, and towns—rural towns—no matter how small they are.

People are starting to think anew about what to do with drug addiction. Is our goal to put people in prison for drug addiction or is our goal to end the addiction? We know that in some cases those who have been imprisoned will not use again. Many times, they will. We know, if people go successfully through treatment, they may be spared the addiction, and it may save their lives. We are coming of age when it comes to drugs in America.

What we try to do with this bill is also to take into consideration criminal defendants who meet certain limited criteria, such as with drug offenses, which is the No. 1 prosecution offense in our Federal system. It takes into consideration drug offenders who are not kingpins, who are not the bosses and are not involved in any violence in the crime, when there is no gun involved and if they are willing to cooperate with the government in closing down the drug operation. If they meet all of those criteria, we say that the court can take that into consideration in sentencing. I think that is a good thing.

I think, in Alton Mills' situation, it would have resulted in a much, much different sentence than what he faced before the commutation by President Obama.

We also want to make certain that in the future those who were sentenced under the old 100-to-1 disparity, as I mentioned earlier, could petition the government for a reconsideration of their sentencing on an individual basis. There will be no guarantee that they will be released, but they will have the opportunity to petition in those situations. I think this is a step in the right direction.

The bill also contains provisions which, I think, are extraordinary when it comes to prison reform. What are we going to do with all of these people? Most of those who are in prison will be coming out someday. Will they come out to commit another crime or create another victim? That would be a failure of the system completely.

Two Senators—one Republican, Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas, and one Democrat, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island—came together with the prison reform bill that has already passed the House with 386 votes, and we have improved it some in the Senate. Basically, it gives to those who are in prison an incentive to develop

skills and training and education levels that will serve them when they leave in order to reduce recidivism and reduce the commission of crime in the future.

I think that is humane. It is sensible. It says to those who truly want to turn their lives around that we are going to give you a chance to prove it. Prove it with your actions, and we will give you a chance to be released earlier and have a chance to go into society in a positive way.

We brought these two together—criminal sentencing and prison reform. It doesn't happen very often around here. The last time we had any measurable impact on the subject was 8 years ago. It was 8 years ago when I introduced my first bill on criminal sentencing reform. I think that bill worked, which, incidentally, I cosponsored with former Senator Jeff Sessions. It gave the individuals an opportunity to petition for early release. In many cases, it saved their lives and gave them a chance. We are back with a bipartisan bill that is called the FIRST STEP Act. This bill, I think, deserves our consideration in the Senate as quickly as possible.

Do you see this empty Senate floor? This is a place to do business. We have some business to do. In the 3 weeks we will be in session at the end of November and in the month of December, we can easily pass this legislation. I sat down with Senator GRASSLEY and Republican and Democratic leaders from the House. They are anxious—we are all anxious—to bring this up. I am going to plead with Senator MCCONNELL and ask everyone to join me to put this measure on the calendar. I believe it will have strong bipartisan support. Democrats and Republicans will join in an effort endorsed by President Trump. How about that for your headline? You don't see that sort of thing happening very often. We have a chance to do it here with this revised FIRST STEP Act.

I thank all those who have worked so hard on it, starting with MIKE LEE, my original cosponsor. I would add to that CHUCK GRASSLEY, who has been a terrific partner from start to finish in making this a bipartisan effort. Special thanks to Senators Cornyn and Whitehouse for marrying up their prison reform package with our sentencing reform package. This could be significant. It could be one of the most important things we do when it comes to criminal justice, not only this year but for a long time.

I commend my colleagues for their cooperation on that, and I hope we can get this job done in the closing weeks of this session.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know looking back on the last 2 years since the 2016 election, time has flown, but it is important to reflect on what we have

been able to accomplish, and, really, it is pretty remarkable. These are not just political accomplishments; these are things that have improved the lives of our constituents—the American people.

As time is running out on the 115th Congress leading up to the holidays, yesterday I spoke about some of our larger accomplishments. Today I want to highlight some of the other important accomplishments we have made. Because they weren't particularly controversial, you didn't see them reported in cable news or in the media or the subject of massive social media campaigns. In addition, there are the economic gains we have seen from passing historic tax reform to the regulatory rollback we have seen, which has unleashed the American economy. We have also passed important public safety legislation, like the opioid legislation, which is designed to help thousands of Americans suffering from drug addiction. It is important to remember the grim statistic that last year alone, 72,000 Americans died from drug overdoses, 50,000 died from opioid overdoses, which include prescription drugs, fentanyl and heroin, most of which come from Mexico. I will touch on that in a moment.

A little over a year ago, the gulf coast of Texas sustained a rain event the likes of which we hope we will never see again. This was called Hurricane Harvey, but instead of damaging winds, in addition, we had incredible amounts of rain, with catastrophic flooding that left Texans dealing with months-long recovery efforts that are still going on today.

I was proud to join with not only my Texas colleagues but also colleagues across the aisle in both Chambers to pass three separate disaster relief bills totaling \$147 billion for Hurricane Harvey aid, as well as the other natural disasters affecting other parts of the country. About \$30 billion of that, I think, is Texas-specific, more or less, in terms of the needs, in terms of the resources that were required not only to recover but also to help mitigate future threats. We know it does little good to fix the problem today if it is going to be repeated tomorrow, and we know Hurricane Harvey is not the last hurricane and the last rain event we are going to have. So we authorized a coastal study that will ultimately lead us to construction of a coastal spine that will help protect the important gulf coast region, where most of the refining capacity in the country is located—and we know that is a national priority—as well as the flood mitigation projects I mentioned a moment ago, by authorizing and funding the Army Corps of Engineers.

We tried to listen—and I did in Texas—to what our constituents said they needed most, and we passed two other pieces of legislation particularly relating to the disaster.

First, we made houses of worship eligible for certain FEMA grants to help

them rebuild after disasters. The second was a tax relief provision similar to the one we passed after Hurricane Katrina, which gave Texans the ability to deduct their property damage costs and access retirement savings on an emergency basis without penalties. Providing that relief was a big help to my constituents.

Disasters tend to bring out the best in all of us because it causes us to do things we didn't know we could actually do. The Texas spirit was perhaps one of the things that was most reassuring following the disasters, and it never wavered.

We saw that spirit again rallied around a community after an unthinkable act of violence at Sutherland Springs, TX, that left 26 people dead and 20 more wounded. Because the U.S. Air Force had failed to upload a felony conviction for domestic violence into the FBI's criminal background check system, the shooter in that case was able to acquire multiple firearms by simply lying about his criminal background record. So we came together, in a bipartisan way, to pass a bill I introduced called the Fix NICS Act—NICS is the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, hence the name—that fixed or at least took great strides toward fixing our broken background check system to ensure that violent criminals can't easily acquire firearms when they are convicted and ineligible under existing law.

We saw that resiliency arise out of another tragedy at Santa Fe High School, where we passed the STOP School Violence Act. I am not suggesting that by passing legislation, we are going to magically wave our wand and stop acts of violence, but we can do things that provide planning, training, safety infrastructure, and law enforcement support for our schools to make them a less soft target.

In an open society, I doubt we will ever be able to stop all acts of violence, but I think these are intended and will have a constructive effect and actually save lives.

A third way we spoke on the issue of public safety in our communities was through another bill I introduced called the Project Safe Neighborhoods Act that was signed into law earlier this year. It passed the Senate unanimously. People think everything is divided here along political lines. Well, we actually pass legislation like this unanimously in the Senate. It authorized the Project Safe Neighborhoods Program at the Department of Justice, which aims to reduce violent crimes by pairing local, State, and Federal law enforcement officials with Federal prosecutors and using tough Federal laws to prosecute gun crimes. These partnerships are proven to reduce violent crimes and deserve our full support. We have also come together to provide help to victims of crime and for the vulnerable.

The President has signed into law three bills I introduced that built upon

my work when I was attorney general of Texas. The first is called the SAFER Act, which is aimed at reducing the backlog of untested rape kits in forensic labs. The second is called the Justice Served Act, which assists law enforcement in prosecuting the most difficult cold cases using the seemingly magical power of DNA testing in forensic labs. The third is a bill I championed called the PROTECT Our Children Act, which reauthorizes important resources combating child exploitation online.

Perhaps the best news story of the last couple of years has been our economy, how it has come roaring back. We have tried to reduce the regulatory burden on employers and job seekers alike, including in the three bills the President has signed into law.

These were targeted bills not designed to change Western civilization but to address specific, real problems that will improve the lives of the people we work for. One of those is the New HOPE Act, which is an occupational licensing reform bill that gives States the tools to reduce barriers to certain professions. It makes no sense because of licensing requirements to basically bar people from doing things they can learn how to do without overly burdensome licensing and training requirements which essentially are designed to protect incumbents.

We have also passed the Jobs for Our Heroes Act, which makes it easier for our veterans to get commercial driver's licenses.

We passed the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act to make sure veterans can get hired by local law enforcement agencies when they come out of the military with the very skills that are needed by our local law enforcement. We know all of our police agencies are working hard to try to recruit good, qualified people to keep our communities safe. They struggle with that, and this will help make that better.

In each of these cases, we tried to listen to the needs of Texans and people across the country and to translate that into legislation that will improve their lives. They don't get top billing on the national news, but they deserve our support, as do the people whom I came in contact with in my State who have inspired these laws.

As we close out the 115th Congress and move into a new Congress in January, these are the types of things we can continue to do together. Because of the midterm elections, our friends in the other body, the House of Representatives—now that Ms. PELOSI will presumably be the next Speaker—have an important decision to make: Do they want to make noise, do they want to harass the President or do they want to work with us to make laws that improve the quality of life for the people we represent? I hope they choose the latter, and, clearly, there is more we can and should do together to help the American people.

I know I am running out of time. I am going to come back a little later on to talk about the caravans that are coming up from Central America through Mexico and what we need to do together to address those.

At this time, I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Kentucky.

S.J. RES. 65

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise today to call for an end to the U.S. involvement in the war in Yemen. There might be a good excuse for not knowing there is a war in Yemen because the media seems to be preoccupied with other things, but we have been involved with supporting the Saudi coalition, the Saudi alliance with nine other nations, including Bahrain, which has been bombing Yemen.

You might not know much about Yemen, either. Yemen is one of the poorest countries on the planet. There are about 17 million people who live on the edge of starvation there. This year they suffered an epidemic of cholera. Over 1 million people had cholera, and thousands of people died. This is a country so impoverished that even when there is no war in Yemen, they live on the very edge of being able to survive. The pictures are heartrending. If you see the pictures of the small children with their swollen bellies—swollen because they don't have enough protein so that the fluid literally drains from their blood system into their bellies. The pictures are heartrending, and your tax dollars are supporting this war.

So I think there ought to be a debate. That is what I stand up today to do: to force a debate over whether we should be involved with aiding and abetting the Saudi coalition in this war in Yemen.

Our Founding Fathers intended that Congress would debate war. It is very, very clear. If you read the Federalist papers, if you read the Constitution, if you read any of the Founding Fathers, if you read any of the first eight Presidents, they said explicitly again and again that the prerogative to declare war was Congress's—that it was specifically taken from the President. It is specifically forbidden for the President to go to war without the permission of Congress.

We have been having a little bit of this debate. About a month ago we had a debate, and, you know what, the administration argued that bombs are not war, that refueling planes that bomb people is not war, that we are not involved with hostilities in Yemen because we don't have troops marching on the ground with muskets. I think it is an absurd notion that you can be refueling bombing planes, supplying the bombs, and, as bombs are raining down on people and civilians are killed and the ones who survive pick up a scrap of the bomb that says "Made in U.S.," tell them we are not involved with the war in Yemen.

Madison, among the Founding Fathers, was quite clear in saying that

the executive branch is the branch most prone to war; therefore, we have, with studied care, vested the power to declare war in Congress. We haven't obeyed that constitutional maxim for a long time. For a long time we have basically abdicated our role. Both parties, Republican and Democrats, have let Presidents, Republican and Democratic, do what they will.

This war started under the previous President, and this war continues under the current President. Yet Congress doesn't have the spine, doesn't have the will to stand up and say: It is our job to declare war. It is our job to represent the people, to listen to the people, and decide whether we should be at war.

The Constitution in article I, section 8 says "Congress shall declare war." It is unequivocal. Yet here we are, involved in yet another war. We are involved in a war in Yemen. We have been involved in a war in Syria. We have also been involved in a war in Libya. We have also now been at war with people in Afghanistan, who had nothing to do with 9/11, 18 years later. These wars go on and on because Congress—and specifically the Senate—doesn't do their job.

We have heard people on television yelling "do your job, do your job" at their legislators. That is fine, but let's debate what our job is. The Constitution is very clear that one of our jobs is to declare war, and we have abdicated that responsibility and have not lived up to it.

I would like to have a direct vote on whether we should be involved in Yemen, a direct vote on whether we either declare war or we don't, but that is forbidden because I am in the minority—not in the minority party but in the minority ideologically. The vast majority of this body doesn't care about directing foreign policy; they say that the President has unitary authority, and the Commander in Chief can do whatever he or she wants. That is what the vast majority of these people believe. So they will vote against this because they do not believe Congress really should tell the President when we go to war.

I would like to vote directly that we should not be at war in Yemen; we should not be involved with supplying, refueling, supplying bombs to the Saudis, the Bahrainis and their coalition. I am forbidden from that vote, but because of a 1976 law called the Arms Export Control Act, I am able to object to arms sales.

We have done this twice in the last year. We objected in a bipartisan way to the sale of arms to Saudi Arabia because we thought their war was unjust, indiscriminate, killing civilians, and not in America's best interests. The first time we had the vote, we got a little over 20 votes to say that we should not be continuing to sell arms to the Saudis while they continue this abomination—20 something votes out of 100. We lost overwhelmingly. We had an-

other vote about 2 or 3 months ago, and we got 47 votes. Now we have the killing and dismemberment of a journalist and dissident by the name of Jamal Khashoggi—something so brazen, so bizarre, so uncivilized that people are now coming together.

In the last few weeks we have quit refueling planes, yet the bombs continue to drop. We are still supplying the bombs.

Things are beginning to change. There is a movement among the public to hold their representatives accountable and say: Why are we at war in Yemen? Why don't you vote on whether we should be at war in Yemen? Why do you abdicate your responsibility to the President?

It is harder for someone like me because the President is of my party and I agree with him on many different issues. But where is the other side? The other side should be rising up and saying: This is a usurpation of power. The President is taking upon himself power that is not his. We should be rising up unanimously in saying: Enough is enough; we are taking back this power.

People talk about this all the time. People pretend to be believers in congressional checks and balances. There are always groups out there for checks and balances. This is a check and a balance. This is a time in which the Senate can tell the President what to do. But watch the votes. Many of the people you see on TV say: We should stand up, and the President this and the President that. On this issue, which is an honest issue of disagreement with the President, stand up and restrict his power. Stand up and tell the President that the Constitution says that war shall be declared by Congress.

But watch the votes here. We will not get a direct vote on the war, though; we will get an indirect vote. We will not even get to vote today on Saudi arms; they are afraid to bring up Saudi arms because they think we might win. But we will vote on one of the coalition partners. The Bahrainis are part of a nine-country coalition fighting this war. They have had casualties, they have dropped bombs, and they have been on the ground in Yemen. They are part of the fighting coalition.

So the resolution today will be specifically about not selling one set of arms sales to Bahrain. The other side will look for all kinds of excuses to say: No, oh, my goodness, Bahrain has been a great ally. I am not disputing that. What I am disputing is that they are getting the message that we are unhappy. We supply them with all of their arms, all right. We get to host our Navy there, great. I am not asking that we end our alliance. I am not asking that we sanction them. I am only saying to stop one sale of arms to send a message that we are done with the war in Yemen, that we are no longer going to sell weapons to countries that are fighting this war in Yemen, and that the war must come to a close.

Some will argue: Well, it is already kind of winding down; we are no longer

refueling their planes. Yet, since Secretary Pompeo said about 3 weeks ago that the Saudi coalition should quit bombing civilian centers, the Saudis have dropped 200 bombs on Hodeida. Hodeida is a city where most of the humanitarian effort and food comes in. Yemen depends—80 percent of its food must be imported. It comes through this one port, for the most part.

The Saudis—since we admonished them, since Secretary Pompeo said that they need to cease and desist from bombing civilian centers—have dropped 200 more bombs on the city of Hodeida, where humanitarian aid comes in. It must stop. Someone must take a stand and say: Enough is enough; we are against the humanitarian disaster in Yemen.

They will argue: Well, then vote on that. I can't have a direct vote on that. They will not let me vote on whether we should be at war in Yemen. I am allowed to vote only on this one small thing. This is a proxy vote. This is a vote that represents whether we should be at war in Yemen. It is an incredibly important vote. It is an attempt to grab back power from the Presidency. It is an attempt to have a check and balance on all Presidents of all parties of all beliefs.

I don't think we should ever sell one arm—one musket, one shotgun—to create a job. Our arms industry is for our national defense. It is a unique industry that is not an entirely private enterprise industry. The arms manufacturer, the military industrial complex is supported overwhelmingly by tax dollars. I am not for anybody being able to buy an F-16. I am not for selling F-16s to Russia or to China, but I am also not for selling any more to Saudi Arabia. I am not for fixing their planes. I am not for giving them replacement parts. Their air force would be shut down in a matter of months if we stopped funding them.

People say: That is too dramatic. You are doing things—they have been such a great ally. We had a Senator yesterday rise at our lunch, and he said: Well, we know he is not a democrat. We know he doesn't believe in representative government. We know he is a thug. Of course they execute and crucify people—crucify people—in Saudi Arabia. It is the best we can do, and we need him vis-a-vis Iran. What will happen? Iran will take over the world if we don't combat them in every little misbegotten civil war in the Middle East.

Here is the point, and this is the point which we should debate and which nobody debates: Who is more evil—the Revolutionary Guard and the Ayatollah of Iran or the Saudi Arabia Kingdom? If you look at it objectively, Saudi Arabia has spent over \$100 billion teaching hatred of Christians, Hindus, and Jews around the world. They have opened tens of thousands of madrassas. The Haqqani network that has actually killed our soldiers in Afghanistan is supplied with money from the Saudis.

The Taliban has gotten money from the Saudis. There was a report that a Saudi royal dropped off a check for \$267 million to the Taliban at one point. So we are fighting these people, and we are arming these people. We should not be arming the enemy.

It is not just one side; the other side has admitted this as well. It is not just Republicans saying this; in a cable that was leaked, Hillary Clinton said that Saudi Arabia was the “most significant source of funding to Sunni terrorist groups worldwide.”

What is it like to live in Saudi Arabia? We might ask Baqir al-Nimr. He was arrested at 17 at a protest. He is still in jail and is scheduled to be executed. They have a real “gloriful” way of executing you in Saudi Arabia: They chop your head off, and then they crucify you. So his head will be chopped off, and then his body will be displayed in a crucifixion post. That is what they will do to him. He was 17 when he was arrested. They have beheaded minors in Saudi Arabia. Oh, but we buy their oil, and we are such good friends with their sheikhs and their Kings.

In Saudi Arabia right now, there are 3,000 people in prison who have not gotten a trial. There are nearly 1,000 people who have been in prison for 3 years without a trial—3 years without a trial, 1,000 people, and yet we continue to say: Oh, yes, but they oppose Iran.

Who is worse—Iran or Saudi Arabia? Maybe neither one of them is good. Do you want to send your son or daughter to fight for the Iranian Revolutionary Guard? No. Do you want to send your son or daughter to fight for the Saudi Kings who crucify people? No. Maybe we don't always have to pick sides. Maybe there is a time that comes when the thousand-year-old war between Sunni and Shia—let them fight it. Is there a reason we always have to send our sons and daughters to the Middle East?

People used to say we have to do it for oil, which was offensive to me. We are doing it for oil and oil profits? We are now independent of their oil. We export oil. We do not need Saudi Arabia.

People say: We have to have them, or Iran will take over the world. Saudi Arabia and their coalition partners spend eight times more on military than Iran does. What happens every time we send a dollar to Saudi Arabia? Iran then asks Russia for stuff. So it is an arms race that is fueled by both of the larger outside powers with their proxies, and everything is a proxy war.

But if you fool yourself into thinking that Saudi Arabia is the good guy and Iran is the bad guy, you have to ask yourself about the \$2 billion that Saudi Arabia is spending in India—\$2 billion over a 2-year period—teaching hatred of Hindus, hatred of Jews, hatred of Christianity, teaching that violent jihad is OK.

Hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars are spent by the Saudis, and people say: We can make a buck,

and we can create a job. I, for one, would not try to create one job by selling arms to people who are our enemy. I don't care about jobs if we are going to have to sell arms to our enemies. The arms belong to the American people, and the arms should be seen as a national security asset. We don't sell arms to Russia, we don't sell arms to China, and we shouldn't sell arms to the Saudis who teach hatred of Christianity.

There are Saudi cities you can't even go to. Christians can't go to Mecca or Medina. You can't carry a Bible in Saudi Arabia. If you try to visit Saudi Arabia and bring a Bible in, you will be rejected at the border. This is not what we are for.

Even those who have advocated for the war are now admitting there is no military solution. Recently, Secretary Pompeo said: No military solution in Yemen; let's cease the bombing. General Mattis has said the same thing—no military solution. But they are not getting the signal. We are telling them there is no military solution, we are telling them to quit bombing civilian areas, and they are still bombing the areas. Since Secretary Pompeo told them a few weeks ago to quit bombing civilian areas, they dropped 200 bombs on Hodeidah. The Saudis aren't getting the message.

The Bahrainis are part of the coalition. Send them a message. I am not saying we sanction Bahrain. I am not saying we kick them out as an ally. I am not saying we end our relationship with the Bahrainis. I am saying don't sell them arms one time. Do you think they will get the message? See, that is a message of strength. A lot of people around here talk about, we must have peace through strength, and we need to have a strong military. Well, do you know what? We need to have a strong foreign policy that says that we are not going to be pushed around by a bunch of two-bit dictators in the Middle East, that we are not going to be led astray and reject all of our values by sending arms into a war where civilians are being killed by the thousands. Seventeen million people in Yemen live on the edge of starvation. The city that a lot of the humanitarian aid comes in through, Hodeidah, is blockaded by the Saudis.

I think that when we make decisions on foreign policy, they first should be made here. The Constitution intended that we declare war and that, really, foreign policy come from the people through the Congress, both House and Senate. If we were to have that debate, we would ask the question: Is our involvement in the war in Yemen in our national security interests? Is our national security enhanced by being at war in Yemen? I think the answer is unequivocally no.

To those who say “Well, we must combat Iran,” Iran is being combatted by Saudi Arabia, but Iran is not a threat to come across the ocean to see us. Guess who has come across the

ocean. Do you remember 9/11? Do you remember who the hijackers were? Fifteen of nineteen of them were from Saudi Arabia. Do you remember the 28 pages of the “9/11 Report” that they wouldn't let the American public read for years and years and years, for over a decade? You can now read those, and the implication is that Saudi Arabia was involved in 9/11, perhaps in the financing, perhaps in the planning. We actually voted overwhelmingly to allow American people's—descendants of those who died on 9/11 to actually sue Saudi Arabia over this because of the implication that, yes, the 28 pages show that they were involved.

So what we should be debating here is, is there a national security risk, or is there a national security enhancement? Is it better for our country? Is it good for America to be involved in the war in Yemen, or does it actually enhance the risks that we will be involved in further war and further drawn into the Middle East?

If you look at the history of our involvement in the Middle East—and President Trump gets this very well. One of the things he says over and over again is that the Iraq war was a mistake, that it was a geopolitical blunder of immeasurable proportions. Why? It is the same thing that has happened over and over in the Middle East: We go in and we topple a strongman. The strongman has a horrible human rights record, and we say we are bringing freedom and democracy. Do you know what we get? We topple the strongman, and we get chaos.

Even decades later, in Afghanistan decades later, we still have chaos. You have chaos in Iraq, you now have chaos in Syria, you have chaos in Yemen, you have chaos in Libya, but it is not made better by our intervention, it is actually made worse. Out of the chaos comes more terrorism. Terrorism loves chaos. It is sort of like, nature abhors a vacuum; well, terrorism loves a vacuum. Terrorism grows and thrives and becomes more organized when they have a vacuum.

My fear in Yemen is that, as the war goes on, as both sides destroy each other in a war that has no real end, then maybe al-Qaida of Yemen will come back and al-Qaida of Yemen will become a dominant player.

Where did ISIS come from? People said ISIS was from Iraq. ISIS grew in Syria, from Raqqa. They started there and moved into Iraq because even after 15 years, the Iraqis were feckless to stop them, but they grew in the chaos of Syria.

Who did we supply, in Syria, with weapons? There was another post from Hillary Clinton to Podesta saying: We have to do something about Saudi Arabia and Qatar because they are indiscriminately supplying arms to al-Qaida and ISIS in Syria.

So because we always think we have to be involved—there can never be a time when we are not fighting on one side or the other—we get involved in

the lesser of the two evils, and so often, the lesser of the two evils is—guess what—still evil. So what has happened is we are drug into everybody's war—war on end in the Middle East—with-out resolution. They have been killing each other for a thousand years, and we think somehow siding with the Sunnis against the Shia is going to bring this war to a conclusion.

The thing is, I think it has been a mistake, and I think it has been counterproductive. I think the war in Yemen is counterproductive. I think our involvement there is leading to more chaos. I think the Senate has abdicated their duty and their role. Under article I, section 8, the Senate is allowed to and should be deciding when we go to war.

People talk about checks and balances, and we should be involved. Somehow we should check the President, who is assuming too much authority. This is your chance today. This is the check-and-balance. This is your proxy vote on the war in Yemen. There will be no direct one because they won't allow it. This will be a proxy vote because it will be about weapons to Bahrain because we are not being allowed a direct vote on the war in Yemen. We should be. It should be one of the most important things we do in the Senate, and that is to direct foreign policy, to decide when we go to war. It is probably the most important thing we do under the Constitution, and we have abdicated it for decade after decade.

I think the American people's frustration with Saudi Arabia is growing. I think the American people want a loud message sent. If you send any other message—some are proposing sanctions on killers. Well, they are in jail, and in all likelihood, they are going to be executed. So we are going to sanction a bunch of people who are in jail and are going to be executed? The Saudis will laugh at that. That is weakness.

Even in the last 3 weeks since Secretary Pompeo said "You need to quit; you need to cease and desist from bombing civilian areas," the Saudis have dropped 200 bombs on civilian areas in Hodeidah. They are not getting the message. If we want to send them a message and send them a message loud and clear, we need to tell them no more arms. The next time they post a weapons sale to Saudi Arabia, we will do the same thing. But this is about the entire coalition of nine countries that are involved in this. Today, it will be about Bahrain, but today is really about Yemen. It is about the question I began this with.

My call today is to end the U.S. involvement in the war in Yemen. We should have debated this in advance. We should have debated this before we got involved in the war in Yemen. Yet there is this creeping mission that happens all the time: The wars begin with the executive branch, they creep and grow larger and larger, and we abdicate our duty and role to vote on these

things. Today is an opportunity to say: Enough is enough. The war in Yemen should end.

It won't be the direct message I would like to send to Saudi Arabia, but it will be an indirect message. If this resolution were to pass, yes, it would be a loud and clear message that we are serious. But what will happen—and watch closely—is that many Members will say: Oh, Bahrain is our ally. We can't do this to our ally.

I am not talking about ending our relationship with Bahrain. I am not talking about never selling arms to them. I am talking about one time, today, don't send them arms. What is the drama about? That, to me, is a very modest step—one time, do not sell our arms. They can be sold in 6 months. Quit bombing Yemen, pull out of the coalition, stop the fight, and we will talk about arms sales.

One time, we should stand up and should send a message from the Senate to the President that we are in charge. Under Article I, Section 8, a declaration of war comes from Congress. We have abdicated that role for too long.

My hope is that today there will be enough of us to send a message, and the message should be loud and clear: The United States should end its involvement in the war in Yemen.

I thank the Presiding Officer.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes with the chairman as well, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, split between us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, reserving the right to object. We had an agreement to have an hour's worth of debate, where the opponents of the bill were given 30 minutes and the proponents of the bill were given 30 minutes, and the unanimous consent allowed me the remaining 30 minutes. The time period has expired. I think we ought to go by some rules and structure around here. Those who are against the bill should come in the allotted time. The time was used by all kinds of other people talking about things not related to the debate. It does a disservice to the debate that we did that.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, if I may, through the Chair, say to the Senator, No. 1, there was nobody on the floor when the Senator made a motion to ultimately reserve all the time in opposition to the end. Had I been on the floor, had I known such a motion was going to be made, I would have objected to that. There was a certain lack of courtesy in that regard.

I say to the Senator, an opposition now will be remembered as an opposition in the future when the Senator is seeking an opportunity. All we are asking for is 5 minutes. If the Senator needs more time to make a final comment—

Mr. PAUL. I think a fair response is that we will grant an additional 5 minutes to opponents of the bill, and if you allow me to conclude in 5 minutes, I am fine with that.

I will respond to the objection to include what I have stated. If that is acceptable, I remove my objection to the modified motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey so modify his request?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I rise in opposition to the resolution. As we evaluate the resolution, we have to consider the characteristics of a specific military system and the context in which it will be used, as well as how we utilize arms sales as a foreign policy tool.

I have much in common with Senator PAUL on the question of Yemen. I have moved in his direction. The Saudis had their opportunity. I am promoting legislation, with several of our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to deal with exactly that. If I am the one holding up arms sales to Saudi Arabia, as we speak, as the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee, that is why it has not come to the floor because I am not letting it go through unless the administration breaks through a hold at the end of the day, which would violate all of the existing processes we have.

This vote is not Yemen. It is not Saudi Arabia. It is not the United Arab Emirates. It is Bahrain. Bahrain is a critical ally to us. It hosts the U.S. Navy's Fifth Fleet, providing a vital naval base from which the United States protects its national security interests in the gulf and throughout the region, and its willingness to host our naval forces also places Bahrain at greater risk from attack from Iran and terrorist groups seeking to do harm to the United States. It is also a security partner as it comes to piracy, al-Qaida, ISIS, and Iran. It hosted an Israeli UNESCO delegation in late June.

I have great disagreement with the Bahranians as it relates to their human rights record. It is abhorrent. We are going to continue to fight on that issue with them. At the end of the day, halting the sale of weapons intended to defend Bahrain's security is not the solution in this particular case.

I will close and yield the balance of time to the chairman. Arms sales to foreign countries provide the United States and this body with important influence and leverage on those countries' views and activities on foreign policy. Sometimes, if used smartly, they can shift a country's actions in a positive direction.

As I said, I am currently opposing an important arms sale to Saudi Arabia due to my concern the Saudis are using these weapons in a specific context inappropriately. Civilian casualties are

on the rise, and the weapons sale is not part of a comprehensive strategy to end the Civil War in Yemen. I urge us, on this particular occasion, to oppose this particular resolution, and I probably will stand with the Senator when the moment comes as it relates to denying the Saudis arms sales, particularly in the midst of what they are doing in Yemen.

With that, I yield to the distinguished Senator of Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I want to thank the ranking member for his comments, his friendship, and welcome him back. I look forward to his leadership on foreign policy issues for many years.

I share his views. I have concerns about the trajectory that Saudi Arabia is on right now. I have concerns about the war in Yemen. We have had hearings. We have people on our committee who are trying to take steps to deal with the war in Yemen.

Obviously, we are very upset with what has happened with the journalist. I think a price needs to be paid. The administration today sent out notice that they were sanctioning 17 individuals who were involved. Hopefully, additional steps will be made.

I asked for a high-level briefing with Mattis, Pompeo, and Gina Haspel to come in as soon as we get back, to share with us what is happening with Saudi Arabia on both fronts, both Yemen and what is happening as it relates to the journalist who was assassinated, in my opinion, at the direction of the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia. I have a lot of concerns.

I think when you have concerns, though, you address those concerns to the people you have concerns with. Bahrain is not one of those. Bahrain certainly has had some issues with human rights, and we have dealt with those. It is a city state in the Persian Gulf where we have 7,800 men and women in uniform who are protecting our interests there, who are a buffer against Iran.

For us to block sales, offensive sales, to the country of Bahrain that is housing one of our most important naval bases over something that has nothing to do with them but has something to do with another country is not a pragmatic nor a sensible step. I hope we will oppose this. I think we will.

I understand the frustrations of the Senator from Kentucky. I do. He shared those many times in the Foreign Relations Committee. I do understand those, but it seems to me that taking something out on a country that is unrelated to what is happening is a very inappropriate and not a mature step for the U.S. Senate to take, and hopefully we will defeat this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Let's be very clear. Bahrain does have something to do with

the war in Yemen. They are part of a nine-country coalition. They have lost soldiers in Bahrain. They have flown bombing missions. Bahrain is an intimate part of the coalition fighting the war.

You might ask yourself, is it enough to do nothing? We are going to put sanctions on people who are in jail. Do you think they care? They are probably going to be beheaded. Sanctions is a way of pretending to do something and doing nothing. The arms sales—I am not saying we never sell arms to Bahrain. I am saying one time we don't. That might get them the message.

People say we don't like the human rights record of Bahrain, it is abominable, but do you think they will react to weakness: Please don't hurt your people, please don't commit atrocities on the majority Shia population?

No, we will sell them arms one time, and they will sit up and say let's have a talk. People respect strength. We don't show strength unless we do something that is more dramatic than putting sanctions on people who are already in prison. This is about Saudi Arabia, but it is also about the coalition of nine countries of which Bahrain is.

If you think meek words will stop the Saudis, listen to this. Three weeks ago, Pompeo said they should cease all bombing of civilian centers. How many bombs have dropped on Hudaydah since he asked them to cease? Two hundred bombs have dropped on Hudaydah—the port where humanitarian aid needs to come in for a starving population—since we told them not to. We said we are not going to refuel their planes anymore. We are not refueling their planes. They are refueling their planes with our planes. Everything they fly is our plane. Their pilots are trained by us. Their mechanics are trained by us. We need to be stronger. It is a sense of weakness. It is a display of weakness not to at least block one arms sales. This is a modest proposal, and it is the least we can do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I move to table the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 65 and 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 243 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Grassley	Reed
Blumenthal	Hassan	Risch
Blunt	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Brown	Heitkamp	Rubio
Burr	Heller	Sasse
Capito	Hoeben	Schatz
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Carper	Inhofe	Scott
Cassidy	Isakson	Shaheen
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Jones	Smith
Cornyn	Kaine	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	King	Tester
Crapo	Klobuchar	Thune
Cruz	Kyl	Tillis
Daines	Lankford	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Ernst	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Flake	Murphy	

NAYS—21

Baldwin	Harris	Murray
Booker	Hirono	Paul
Cantwell	Leahy	Peters
Casey	Lee	Sanders
Durbin	Markey	Van Hollen
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Moran	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Coons
Nelson

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michelle Bowman, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2006.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Texas.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wanted to come back to the floor after speaking a little earlier this morning about the so-called caravan of migrants coming from Central America up through Mexico and who are now located in Tijuana, many of whom will be seeking asylum here in the United States. Coming from Texas with a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico, caravans are not unheard of; in fact, we have many caravans showing up on a daily basis at Border Patrol stations, including unaccompanied children and families.

What has happened is that the cartels—these transnational criminal organizations—have figured out, as part of their business model, that they can make money by shipping migrants up through Mexico into the United States or they can ship drugs from Mexico into the United States or traffic in children and women for sex slavery.