

day will never come where men and women of honest hearts and good faith cannot come together and find common goals worth fighting for together.

BILL and I have served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on the Senate Commerce Committee, but the principal area where BILL and I have had the privilege of working closely together concerns space. BILL and I have worked hand in hand promoting and protecting America's program of space exploration and supporting the critical institutions in the State of Texas, the State of Florida, and throughout the country that have made our country a world leader in space. It has been a truly bipartisan partnership. Both BILL and I believe that America is and should be going forward the leader in space, that we have a responsibility, and that there are great and glorious things to accomplish for mankind through space exploration. In this time of bitter, partisan division, of nasty personal rivalries, we have been able to see truly bipartisan cooperation.

We worked together hand in hand on the 2015 commercial space bill, passed into law and signed into law by President Obama. We worked hand in hand on the NASA Authorization Act of 2017. We worked hand in hand and passed that into law, signed into law by President Trump. There are very few major, substantive areas that have major legislation, one signed by Obama and one signed by Trump. I think that is a reflection of the bipartisan cooperation we have seen.

We worked hand in hand on the Space Frontier Act, and we are working together to extend the operation of the International Space Station to 2030. That accomplishment, that cooperation is good for America, and it is good for our leadership in space.

I have to say that I am still jealous that, unlike Senator NELSON, I haven't been on an actual trip to space for a hands-on experience, but I suppose anything can happen.

BILL, I promise you, our work will continue. America's leadership in space will continue. We will persevere and constantly show those who say it can't be done that there is still the will to drive, to explore, to create, to learn, and to search the unknown for answers.

BILL, you are right—I believe that in our lifetime, a human being will step foot on the surface of Mars and that the first boot that lands on the red planet will be the American boot of an American astronaut planting the flag of the United States of America.

There is still a will in our Nation to tame the stars and behold the wonders of creation even closer. I will say that spirit of exploration also inspires generations of little boys and little girls who look to the skies and wonder, what if? We cannot limit our gaze on the Earth below us; it isn't in our nature.

I will say finally, in addition to his commitment to space leadership—and I would note that in addition to BILL's

bipartisan cooperation, his team worked hand in hand with my team, both committed to passing meaningful, important legislation, to finding compromises that would make it not just through the Senate but through the House and be signed into law, and the members of his staff were skilled and dedicated partners in producing those results.

But I will tell you, beyond that, on a very personal level, BILL is a good man. Just a moment ago, when I congratulated him on his farewell speech, he chuckled and said: I may be one of the only people who have taken you to dinner. And you know, that is right.

I remember back in 2013—my first year in this body—it was a tumultuous time. We were in the midst of battles where more than a few bare-knuckle punches were being thrown all around. Right in the midst of that, BILL said: Ted, why don't you come out and have dinner with Grace and me. The two of them took me to dinner, and we had a delightful, relaxing, engaging dinner. We didn't debate big policy; we simply talked as three human beings privileged to have the chance to serve our country. It was a gesture of friendship.

We all know that Harry Truman famously said: If you want a friend in politics, buy a dog. That has not been the approach BILL NELSON has taken to politics. He extended a hand of friendship, and that blossomed into cooperation, and it blossomed into accomplishments together for the United States and for the States of Florida and Texas.

BILL, it has been a privilege to work with you, and I look forward to continuing to work with you in the years ahead in your next chapter. It is an honor to serve with you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 261 Leg.]

#### YEAS—60

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Paul
Booker	Heinrich	Peters
Brown	Heitkamp	Reed
Cantwell	Hirono	Risch
Cardin	Jones	Sanders
Carper	Kaine	Schatz
Casey	King	Schumer
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lee	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Crapo	Markey	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Flake	Murphy	Young

#### NAYS—39

Alexander	Gardner	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeben	Rubio
Corker	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott
Cotton	Isakson	Shelby
Cruz	Johnson	Sullivan
Enzi	Kennedy	Thune
Ernst	Kyl	Toomey
Fischer	Lankford	Wicker

#### NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) to direct the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe there are problems with the law governing the consideration of these types of resolutions. One of biggest is the consideration of amendments. I have a series of parliamentary inquiries that I think will help clarify the problems with the statute.

Parliamentary inquiry: Does this statute provide any guidelines for the consideration of amendments on this resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it does not. The statute does not set forth the text to be used in the joint resolution, and this statute uses the expedited procedures from the Arms Export Control Act, a statute which does not allow amendments, so there are no parameters for the consideration of amendments built into the language.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe that most times the Senate uses expedited procedures, we have either a germaneness requirement for amendments or they cannot be amended. Can the Chair expound on what some of those are and what that concept means in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Generally speaking, when the Senate considers a measure under statutory expedited procedures, like the Budget Act, the Congressional Review Act, the Trade Act, or the Arms Control Act—or

even under the Cloture Rule—there are guardrails for the consideration of the measure and for amendments thereto. There are statutes and rules with prescribed text, limits on debate time, jurisdictional fences, filing deadlines, and germaneness requirements or a complete prohibition on amendments. Often, there are points of order and waivers written into the structure as well. The Senate trades its normal procedure of unfettered debate and amendment and the need for 60 votes to end debate and consideration for a more predictable, structured, and streamlined process of consideration and a majority threshold vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. In the opinion of the Chair, is a statute with no end point for consideration and no restrictions on text or amendments consistent with the other expedited procedures which the Senate often uses?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The construct is inconsistent with the concepts embodied in other expedited processes—even those that are themselves flawed—and the opportunity for abuse of this process is limitless.

Mr. McCONNELL. I agree with the Chair, and I think the Senate should speak to this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I think it is important when using expedited procedures, especially on matters of national security such as this, the Senate limit consideration to the matter at hand. Therefore, I raise a point of order that amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) must be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The laws governing the consideration of this type of resolution do not prescribe what type of amendments can be considered. The Senate has not previously considered this question; therefore, the Chair submits the question to the Senate for its decision. Shall amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered?

The question is debatable for 1 hour. Mr. CORKER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I just wanted clarification. Was it section 1546 or 1446?

You are right, OK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded.

The question is, Shall amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered?

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 262 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Gardner	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Barrasso	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Grassley	Perdue
Blumenthal	Harris	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Brown	Heitkamp	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Cantwell	Hirono	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sanders
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schatz
Casey	Isakson	Schumer
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Collins	Jones	Shaheen
Coons	Kaine	Shelby
Corker	Kennedy	Smith
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cotton	Kyl	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Leahy	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall
Duckworth	Markey	Van Hollen
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Warren
Ernst	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Wyden
Flake	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—3

Cruz

Lee Paul

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The point of order is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to use an oversized floor display.

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

YEMEN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about one of the great humanitarian crises facing our planet, and that is the horrific war in Yemen.

In March of 2015, under the leadership of Muhammad bin Salman, who was then the Saudi Defense Minister and is now, of course, the Crown Prince, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates intervened in Yemen's ongoing civil war. As a result of the Saudi-UAE intervention, Yemen is now experiencing the worst humanitarian disaster in the world.

According to the United Nations, Yemen is at risk of the most severe famine in more than 100 years, with some 14 million people facing starvation. In one of the poorest countries on Earth, as a result of this terrible war, according to the Save the Children organization, some 85,000 Yemeni children have already starved to death over the last several years, and millions more face starvation if the war continues.

Further, Yemen is currently experiencing the worst cholera outbreak in

the world, with there being as many as 10,000 new cases each week, according to the World Health Organization. This is a disease that is spread by infected water that causes severe diarrhea and dehydration and will only accelerate the death rate. The cholera outbreak has occurred because Saudi bombs have destroyed Yemen's water infrastructure and because people there are no longer able to access clean water.

Last week, New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof wrote an article, which I urge all Members to read, that describes his recent visit to Yemen.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the New York Times article, "Your Tax Dollars Help Starve Children."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 7, 2018]

OPINION—YOUR TAX DOLLARS HELP STARVE CHILDREN

(By Nicholas Kristof)

ADEN, Yemen.—He is an 8-year-old boy who is starving and has limbs like sticks, but Yaqoob Walid doesn't cry or complain. He gazes stolidly ahead, tuning out everything, for in late stages of starvation the human body focuses every calorie simply on keeping the organs functioning.

Yaqoob arrived unconscious at Al Sadaqa Hospital here, weighing just over 30 pounds. He has suffered complications, and doctors say that it is unclear he will survive and that if he does he may suffer permanent brain damage.

Some 85,000 children may have already died here in Yemen, and 12 million more people may be on the brink of starvation, casualties in part of the three-year-old American-backed Saudi war in Yemen. United Nations officials and aid experts warn that this could become the worst famine the world has seen in a generation.

"The risk of a major catastrophe is very high," Mark Lowcock, the United Nations humanitarian chief, told me. "In the worst case, what we have in Yemen now has the potential to be worse than anything any professional in this field has seen during their working lives."

Both the Obama and Trump administrations have supported the Saudi war in Yemen with a military partnership, arms sales, intelligence sharing and until recently air-to-air refueling. The United States is thus complicit in what some human rights experts believe are war crimes.

The bottom line: Our tax dollars are going to starve children.

I fell in love with Yemen's beauty and friendliness on my first visit, in 2002, but this enchanting country is now in convulsions. When people hear an airplane today in much of Yemen, they flinch and wonder if they are about to be bombed, and I had interviews interrupted by automatic weapons fire overhead.

After witnessing the human toll and interviewing officials on both sides, including the president of the Houthi rebels who control much of Yemen, I find the American and Saudi role in this conflict to be unconscionable. The Houthis are repressive and untrustworthy, but this is not a reason to bomb and starve Yemeni children.

What is most infuriating is that the hunger is caused not by drought or extreme weather, but by cynical and failed policies in Riyadh and Washington. The starvation does

not seem to be an accidental byproduct of war, but rather a weapon in it. Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, backed by the United States, are trying to inflict pain to gain leverage over and destabilize the Houthi rebels. The reason: The Houthis are allied with Iran.

The governments of Saudi Arabia and the United States don't want you to see pictures like Yaqoob's or reflect on the suffering in Yemen. The Saudis impose a partial blockade on Houthi areas, banning commercial flights and barring journalists from special United Nations planes there. I've been trying for more than two years to get through the Saudi blockade, and I finally was able to by tagging onto Lowcock's United Nations delegation.

After a major famine, there is always soul-searching about how the world could have allowed this to happen. What's needed this time is not soul-searching a few years from now, but action today to end the war and prevent a cataclysm.

The problem in Yemen is not so much a shortage of food as it is an economic collapse—GDP has fallen in half since the war started—that has left people unable to afford food.

Yaqoob was especially vulnerable. He is the second of eight children in a poor household with a father who has mental health problems and can't work steadily. Moreover, the father, like many Yemenis, chews qat—a narcotic leaf that is very widely used in Yemen and offers an easy high. This consumes about \$1 a day, reducing the budget available for food. The family sold some land to pay for Yaqoob's care, so its situation is now even more precarious.

A few rooms down from Yaqoob was Fawaz Abdullah, 18 months old, his skin mottled and discolored with sores. Fawaz is so malnourished that he has never been able to walk or say more than "Ma" or "Ba."

Fawaz's mother, Ruqaya Saleh, explained that life fell apart after her home in the port city of Hudaydah was destroyed by a bomb (probably an American one, as many are). Her family fled to Aden, and her husband is struggling to find occasional work as a day laborer.

"I used to be able to buy whatever I wanted, including meat and fish," she told me. Since fleeing, she said, war-induced poverty has meant that she hasn't been able to buy a single fish or egg—and that is why Fawaz suffers severe protein deficiency.

"They asked me to buy milk for Fawaz, but we can't afford it now," she said.

We think of war casualties as men with their legs blown off. But in Yemen the most common war casualties are children like Fawaz who suffer malnutrition.

Some will die. Even the survivors may suffer lifelong brain damage. A majority of Yemen children are now believed to be physically stunted from malnutrition (46 percent were stunted even before the war), and physical stunting is frequently accompanied by diminished brain development.

"These children are the future of Yemen," Dr. Aida Hussein, a nutrition specialist, told me, looking at Fawaz. "He will be stunted. How will he do in school?"

The war and lack of health care facilities have also led to outbreaks of deadly diseases like diphtheria and cholera. Half of the country's clinics and hospitals are closed.

In the capital, Sana, I met a child who was suffering both malnutrition and cholera. The boy was Saddam Hussein (he was named for the Iraqi leader), eight years old, and the parents repeat the mantra I hear from everyone: Life is much worse now because of the war.

"We don't know what we will eat tomorrow," Saddam's mother told me.

Yemen began to disintegrate in the aftermath of the Arab Spring, and then the Houthis, a traditional clan in the north, swept down on Sana and seized much of the country. The Houthis follow Zaydi Islam, which is related to the Shiite branch dominant in Iran, and the Saudis and some Americans see them as Iranian stooges.

In some ways, the Houthis have been successful. They have imposed order and crushed Al Qaeda and the Islamic State in the parts of Yemen they control, and in Sana I felt secure and didn't fear kidnapping.

However, the Houthis operate a police state and are hostile to uncovered women, gays and anyone bold enough to criticize them. They recruit child soldiers from the age of about 12 (the Saudi- and American-backed forces wait until boys are about 15), interfere with food aid, and have engaged in torture and attacks on civilians.

Still, the civilian loss of life has overwhelmingly been caused not by the Houthis but by Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and America, through both bombings and starvation. It's ridiculous for the Trump administration to be exploring naming the Houthis a terrorist organization. And while the Houthis are allies of Iran, I think the Saudis exaggerate when they suggest that the Houthis are Iranian pawns.

The foreign minister on the Houthi side is Hisham Sharaf Abdalla, a congenial American-educated official.

"I love the U.S.," Mr. Sharaf told me. "We look to the U.S. as the only force that can stop this war."

Peace talks are now beginning in Sweden—few people expect them to solve the crisis soon—and he insisted that his side was eager to reach a peace deal and improve relations with America.

After our conversation, he brought me over to his desk and showed me his assault rifle and two handguns. "When I was in the U.S., I was a member of the N.R.A.," he told me. "I would like to have an N.R.A. chapter in Yemen."

Mr. Sharaf talks a good game but is not himself a Houthi, just an ally, so I wondered if he was a figurehead trotted out to impress foreigners. Later I interviewed a man whose power is unquestioned: Muhammad Ali al-Houthi, the president of the Supreme Revolutionary Committee. As his name signifies, he is a member of the Houthi clan.

An aide picked me up and ferried me to him, for President Houthi changes locations daily to avoid being bombed by the Saudis.

President Houthi, a large, confident man with a traditional dagger at his belly, was friendly to me but also suspicious of the United States and full of conspiracy theories. He suggested that Washington was secretly arming Al Qaeda and that the United States was calling the shots for Saudi Arabia in Yemen, at the behest of Israel.

Still, he said that he wanted peace and that although the Houthis have fired missiles at Saudi Arabia, his side would pose no threat to Saudi Arabia if the Saudis would only end their assault on Yemen.

"There's no need for enmity with the United States," he told me in Arabic, and that seemed a message he wanted me to convey to Washington and the American people.

I asked President Houthi about the sarkha, the group's slogan: "God is great! Death to America! Death to Israel! Curses on the Jews! Victory to Islam!" That didn't seem so friendly, I said.

"It's nothing against the American people," he replied. "It's directed toward the system."

When I asked about Saudi and American suggestions that the Houthis are Iranian pawns, he laughed.

"That's just propaganda," he said. "I ask you: Have you ever seen one Iranian in

Yemen? Do we speak Farsi?" This was all a trick, he said, analogous to the allegations of weapons of mass destruction used to justify war with Iraq.

While the Houthis are called "rebels," they clearly rule their territory. In contrast, the Saudi- and American-backed "internationally recognized government" of Yemen is a shell that controls almost no territory—hence it is based in Riyadh. The "president" of this exile government, Abdu Rabbu Mansour Hadi, is said to be gravely ill, and when he is gone it will be even more difficult to sustain the fiction that this is a real government.

More broadly, I don't see any hint of a Saudi or American strategy. There's little sign that bombing and starvation will actually dislodge the Houthis, while the Saudi military action and resulting chaos has benefited the Yemeni branches of Al Qaeda and the Islamic State. In that sense, America's conduct in Yemen has hurt our own national security.

In one sign of the ineffectiveness of the Western-backed government, the hunger is now as severe in its areas as in the rebel-held north. I saw worse starvation in Aden, the lovely seaside city in the south that is nominally run by the internationally recognized government, than in Houthi-controlled Sana.

And while I felt reasonably secure in Houthi-controlled areas, I was perpetually nervous in Aden. Abductions and murders occur regularly there, and my guesthouse offered not a mint on the pillow, but a bullet-proof vest; at night, sleep was interrupted by nearby fighting among unknown gunmen.

What limited order exists in Aden is provided by soldiers from the United Arab Emirates and allied militias, and I worry that the U.A.E. is getting fed up with the war and may pull them out without alternative arrangements for security. If that happens, Aden may soon plunge into Somalia-like chaos.

Mohamed Zemam, the governor of the central bank, believes that there are ways to shore up the economy and prevent starvation. But he cautions that the risk of another Somalia is real, and he estimates that there may be two million Yemenis in one fighting force or another.

"What they have is the way of the gun," he said. "If we don't solve that, we will have problems for 100 years."

Another danger is that the Saudi coalition will press ahead so that fighting closes the port of Hudaydah, through which most food and fuel come.

I stopped in Saudi Arabia to speak to senior officials there about Yemen, and we had some tough exchanges. I showed them photos on my phone of starving children, and they said that this was unfortunate and undesired. "We are not devils," one said indignantly. They insisted that they would welcome peace—but that they must confront the Houthis.

"The most important thing for us is national security," the Saudi ambassador to Yemen, Mohammed Al-Jabir, told me. Dr. Abdullah Al Rabeeah, an adviser to the royal court and director of a fund that provides aid to Yemen, told me that Saudis don't want to see hunger in Yemen but added: "We will continue to do what it takes to fight terrorism. It's not an easy decision."

Saudi and U.A.E. officials note that they provide an enormous amount of humanitarian aid to Yemen. This is true, and it mitigates the suffering there. But it's difficult to give the Saudis much credit for relieving the suffering of a country that they are bombing and starving.

To avert a catastrophe in Yemen, the world needs to provide more humanitarian aid. But above all, the war has to end.

"You're not going to solve this long-term until the war is ended," said David Beasley, the executive director of the World Food Program. "It's a man-made problem, and it needs a man-made solution."

That solution will entail strong American backing for a difficult United Nations-backed peace process involving Yemeni factions and outsiders, aiming for a measure of power sharing. This diplomatic process requires engaging the Houthis, not just bombing them. It also means a cease-fire and pressure on all sides to ensure humanitarian access and the passage of food and fuel. The best leverage America has to make the Saudis part of the solution is to suspend arms sales to Riyadh so long as the Saudis continue the war.

In conference rooms in Riyadh and Washington, officials simply don't fathom the human toll of their policies.

In a makeshift camp for displaced people in Aden, I met a couple who lost two daughters—Bayan, 11, and Bonyan, 8—in a bombing in a crowded market.

"I heard the bomb and I went running after them," the dad, Ahmed Abdullah, told me with an ache in his voice. "They were dead. One had her skull burst open, and the other had no arms or legs left."

He told me that the family then fled, and he married off a 15-year-old daughter so that someone else would be responsible for feeding her. This is common: The share of girls married by age 18 has increased from 50 percent before the war to two-thirds today, according to Unicef.

Another son died of fever when the family could not afford to take the boy to a hospital. There are several other children, and none of them are going to school any more; a 10-year-old daughter, Baraa, who is next in line to be married, couldn't tell me what seven plus eight equals.

A bit hesitantly, I told Ahmed that I thought that my country, America, had probably provided the bomb that had killed his daughters. He was not angry, just resigned.

"I am not an educated person," he told me earnestly. "I am a simple parent." And then he offered more wisdom than I heard from the sophisticated policy architects in America and Saudi Arabia: "My message is that I want the war to stop."

Mr. SANDERS. Let me just take this opportunity to quote some of what he said in that December 7 New York Times article:

Some 85,000 children may have already died here in Yemen, and 12 million more people may be on the brink of starvation, casualties in part of the three-year-old American-backed Saudi war in Yemen. United Nations officials and aid experts warn that this could become the worst famine the world has seen in a generation.

"The risk of a major catastrophe is very high," Mark Lowcock, the United Nations humanitarian chief, told me. "In the worst case, what we have in Yemen now has the potential to be worse than anything any professional in this field has seen during their working lives."

Nicholas Kristof continues:

What is most infuriating is that the hunger is caused not by drought or extreme weather, but by cynical and failed policies in Riyadh and Washington. The starvation does not seem to be an accidental byproduct of war, but rather a weapon in it. Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, backed by the United States, are trying to inflict pain to gain leverage over and destabilize the Houthi

rebels. The reason: The Houthis are allied with Iran.

He continues:

The problem in Yemen is not so much a shortage of food as it is an economic collapse—GDP has fallen in half since the war started—that has left people unable to afford food.

Kristof continues, and I want you to hear this:

We think of war casualties as men with their legs blown off. But in Yemen the most common war casualties are children like Fawaz who suffer malnutrition.

He continues:

Some will die. Even the survivors may suffer lifelong brain damage. A majority of Yemen children are now believed to be physically stunted from malnutrition.

Let me repeat that:

A majority of Yemen children are now believed to be physically stunted from malnutrition (46 percent were stunted even before the war), and physical stunting is frequently accompanied by diminished brain development.

"These children are the future of Yemen," Dr. Aida Hussein, a nutrition specialist, told me, looking at Fawaz. "He will be stunted. How will he do in school?"

The war and lack of health care facilities have also led to outbreaks of deadly diseases like diphtheria and cholera. Half of the country's clinics and hospitals are closed.

That was written by Nick Kristof of the New York Times.

The fact of the matter is that the United States, with very little media attention, has been Saudi Arabia's partner in this horrific war. We have been providing the bombs the Saudi-led coalition has been using, refueling their planes before they drop those bombs, and assisting with intelligence.

In too many cases, our weapons are being used to kill civilians. In August, it was an American-made bomb that obliterated a schoolbus full of young boys, killing dozens and wounding many others. A CNN report found evidence that American weapons have been used in a string of such deadly attacks on civilians since the war began.

According to the independent monitoring group, Yemen Data Project, between 2015 and March 2018, more than 30 percent of the Saudi-led coalition's targets have been nonmilitary.

A few weeks ago, I met with several brave human rights activists from Yemen in my office. They had come to urge Congress to put a stop to this war. They told me, clearly, when Yemenis see "Made in USA" on the bombs that are killing them, it tells them the USA is responsible for this war, and that is the sad truth.

The bottom line is, the United States should not be supporting a catastrophic war led by a despotic regime with a dangerous and irresponsible military policy.

Some have suggested that Congress moving to withdraw support from this war would undermine U.N. efforts to reach a peace agreement, but I would argue that the exact opposite is true. It

is the promise of unconditional U.S. support for the Saudis that have undermined the efforts toward peace. We have evidence for this.

Just yesterday, we received news that U.N. Special Envoy Martin Griffiths made a breakthrough agreement for the exchange in that war of some 15,000 prisoners—a significant development. This is an important step in building the necessary trust for a broader peace agreement.

A piece published today in TRT World observes: "[T]here seems to be a firmer willingness to reach an agreement than in previous talks, as the Yemeni government realises that the international pressure on its backer, Saudi Arabia, is growing."

So our effort to move this resolution forward may have already made a positive impact. I thank all of my 18 co-sponsors and all of the many civil society organizations—progressive and conservative—who have worked so hard to raise awareness of this horrific conflict.

Above and beyond the humanitarian crisis, this war has been a disaster for our national security and for the security of the region. The administration defends our engagement in Yemen by overstating Iranian support for the Houthi rebels. Let me be clear. Iran's support for Houthis is of serious concern for me, and I believe for all of us, but the fact is, the relationship between Iran and the Houthis has only been strengthened with the intensification of the war. This war is creating the very problem the Trump administration claims it wants to solve.

Further, the war is also undermining the broader effort against violent extremists. A 2016 State Department report found the conflict has helped al-Qaida and ISIS "deepen their inroads across much of the country." This war, as I see it, is both a humanitarian and a strategic disaster.

Further—and I think it is important to state what everybody knows, although we don't talk about it terribly often—Saudi Arabia is a despotic regime, controlled by one family, the Saud family, one of the wealthiest and most powerful families on Earth.

In a 2017 report by the Cato Institute—a conservative think tank—Saudi Arabia was ranked 149th out of 159 countries for freedom and human rights. For decades, the Saudis have funded schools, mosques, and preachers who promote an extreme form of Islam known as Wahhabism.

In Saudi Arabia today, women are not treated as second-class citizens; they are treated as third-class citizens. Women still need, in the year 2018, the permission of a male guardian to go to school or to get a job. They have to follow a strict dress code and can be stoned to death for adultery or flogged for spending time in the company of a man who is not their relative.

Earlier this year, Saudi activist, Loujain al-Hathloul, a leader in the fight for women's rights in Saudi Arabia, was kidnapped from Abu Dhabi and

forced to return to the country. She is currently being held without charges. The same is true of many other Saudi political activists.

Human Rights Watch recently reported that imprisoned women activists have been subjected to torture, including electric shocks, and other forms of physical and sexual assault.

Further, as every Member of the Senate knows or should know, there is now overwhelming evidence that Saudi Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman was responsible for the brutal murder of Jamal Khashoggi, a Saudi dissident who lived in the United States. He was a columnist for the Washington Post. He made the mistake of going into the Saudi consulate in Turkey and never came out alive. We believe his body was dismembered, and nobody knows where it is.

Unbelievably, President Trump continues—despite the overwhelming evidence of the Crown Prince's involvement in the murder of a man living in the United States, a Saudi dissident journalist—to proclaim his love and affection for the Crown Prince and the Saudi regime, but that is not how, in my view, the American people feel.

For too many years, American men and women in our military have put their lives on the line in the never-ending struggle for democracy and human rights, and we cannot and must not turn their struggles, their sacrifices aside in order to follow the military adventurism of a despotic regime. That is not what this country is supposed to be about.

Finally, an issue that has long been a concern to many of us—conservatives and progressives—is that this war has not been authorized by Congress and is therefore unconstitutional. Article I of the Constitution clearly states it is Congress, not the President, that has the power to send our men and women into war—Congress, not the President.

The Framers of our Constitution, the Founders of this country, gave the power to declare war to Congress—the branch most accountable to the people—not to the President, who is often isolated from the reality of what is taking place in our communities.

The truth is—and Democratic and Republican Presidents are responsible, and Democratic and Republican Congresses are responsible—that for many years, Congress has not exercised its constitutional responsibility over whether our young men and women go off to war.

I think there is growing sentiment all over this country from Republicans, from Democrats, from Independents, from progressives, and from conservatives that right now, Congress cannot continue to abdicate its constitutional responsibility.

I believe we have become far too comfortable with the United States engaging in military interventions all over the world. We have now been in Afghanistan for over 17 years—the longest war in American history. Our

troops are now in Syria under what I believe are questionable authorities. The time is long overdue for Congress to reassert its constitutional role in determining when and where our country goes to war.

If you want to vote for a war, vote for a war. If you want to vote against a war, vote against a war, but we as a Congress have to accept our constitutional responsibility; that it is ours, not the Presidents of the United States.

This resolution provides that opportunity. It finally says that in this one war in Yemen—that terrible, horrific war—that Congress is prepared to act, and I hope very much that all of us will seize this opportunity.

For the sake of starving children in Yemen; for the sake of what this country stands for in terms of democracy and human rights and not following the leadership of a despotic, authoritarian regime; for the sake of the U.S. Constitution and the fact that it is Congress and not the President who has the authority to make war; for all of these reasons and more, I ask strong support for this important resolution.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator for most of the comments he made. I think they were made very eloquently. I share many of the same concerns the Senator has.

I voted to cause this to come out of committee because I felt this discussion on the Senate floor needed to take place.

The Senator from Vermont knows I have concerns about using this vehicle to do it, but by causing this debate to take place, many of the concerns the Senator has expressed will be expressed by others, and I agree with many of those.

Saudi Arabia has not conducted this war in a manner, in my opinion, that takes into account the great harm that is taking place with civilians. I agree with that 100 percent.

I am more than nonplussed over the fact that I believe—and I have sat in a very detailed—very detailed—intelligence review of what happened with the journalist at the consulate in Turkey, and I absolutely believe that if the Crown Prince came before a jury in the United States of America, he would be convicted guilty in under 30 minutes. I absolutely believe he directed it; I believe he monitored it; and I believe he is responsible for it.

I have had concerns about using this vehicle, and I have concerns about what this may mean as we set a precedent about refueling and intelligence activities being considered hostilities. I am concerned about that.

I think the Senator knows we have operations throughout Northern Africa, where we are working with other governments on intelligence to counter terrorism. We are doing refueling activities in Northern Africa now, and it

concerns me—he knows I have concerns—that if we use this vehicle, then we may have 30 or 40 instances where this vehicle might be used to do something that really should not be dealt with by the War Powers Act.

I will say, the strong passage of the germaneness issue we just dispensed with helps. It helps a great deal. So now, in the future, if this particular vehicle is utilized, we now know we have set the precedent that only germane issues can be brought up.

I did have concerns—and we have now solved those—that other issues might be brought up and all of a sudden, the leaders would lose control of the floor. I would like to see Members have more votes. I agree with that. But I think we have now narrowed this in a very appropriate way.

The Senator and I have discussed a resolution that is separate and apart from this. I have agreed with Senators on the other side of the aisle that I will not introduce that resolution until this issue has been dispensed with. I do hope we will have a unanimous vote on it to strongly condemn the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia for the actions he has taken relative to killing the journalist—who was a resident of the United States and has children living here—in the consulate in Turkey. That is a separate issue that I hope we will take up almost immediately after we dispense with this.

I want to thank the Senator for his concern. I share many of those concerns. We have some legal concerns right now about using this vehicle, and the Senator knows that. I am concerned about where this goes down the road. We will have some amendments we will deal with over the next day or so that may clear that up to a degree.

I just want to say to him that even though we have legal concerns about this particular process, I thank him for his concern for the citizens there, for his admonishment, for his demarching of a Crown Prince in Saudi Arabia who I believe is out of control, doing things on top of killing journalists—blockading Qatar without even thinking, arresting a Prime Minister in Lebanon—things that no one would think would be appropriate for international norms.

I know we will have other speakers coming to the floor. We may disagree on process, but many of the issues the Senator has brought up today I agree with wholeheartedly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss S.J. Res. 54, a pointed statement from the U.S. Senate that the status quo in Yemen is not tenable, that we will not stand idly by as the President lends our country's name to the calamitous military forays of another nation, and that our security partners across the world do not have a blank check.

To my knowledge, this is the first time the Senate has considered a joint

resolution under this provision, which is directly derived from the Wars Powers Resolution. This is an important step to reasserting Congress's role in authorizing the use of force. I was proud to see a strong show of support for the procedural vote to move this resolution forward, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle continue to embrace that moral fortitude.

I am also pleased to support Senator YOUNG's amendment to this resolution, which I understand Senator SANDERS also supports. This language would clarify that refueling operations definitively constitute U.S. support for hostilities in this context, and I know he has been very focused on this issue of Yemen and a critical voice in the Senate on this crisis.

Some may have been holding out hope that the administration would show a good-faith effort to hold the Saudi coalition accountable for its actions in Yemen or to hold the Saudi Government and the Crown Prince accountable for all of their actions. Well, we haven't seen that leadership. On the contrary, I believe that, in spite of concrete evidence, the Trump administration is intent on doing nothing to hold the Saudi Government or the Crown Prince responsible for their actions.

As we debate a path forward to address the tragic humanitarian crisis in Yemen and to hold the Saudi coalition and the Houthi combatants accountable for their actions, children in Yemen continue to starve, people continue to die, and more reports about gruesome torture of detainees continue to emerge. Sadly, we don't actually know the extent of the devastation. Some humanitarian organizations on the ground estimate that as many as 50,000 people have died, with more than 14 million on the brink of starvation. Save the Children recently posited that as many as 130 children are dying each and every day.

We may not know the exact numbers, but we know enough to know that the conflict in Yemen has produced the world's worst humanitarian crisis. The Saudi coalition must take responsibility for its actions, and, likewise, the Houthis and their Iranian backers also bear the burden of this tragedy.

The United States can take concerted and strategic diplomatic steps to ensure that our involvement—any involvement—promotes a net positive outcome for regional stability, for our own security interests, and for the Yemeni people. We can invest in the U.N.-led talks in Sweden. We can wholeheartedly promote diplomacy as a path forward to solve this conflict, which our own defense and diplomatic leaders concede has no military solution.

But let's be clear. This resolution is very important, and I wholeheartedly support it. I have worked so that it can be preserved with only germane amendments. But the resolution itself will not stop the war in Yemen, nor will it somehow stop the immense human suf-

fering, nor put an end to human rights violations.

What this resolution does do, however, is send a strong message to the Saudis about U.S. global leadership. It is a message that says the United States will not stand by as countries—even those with which we have important security relationships—flagrantly violate international norms.

The United States must assert moral leadership on the global stage. We must proudly embrace the immutable fact that our strongest relationships are those rooted in shared values, such as respect for human life, respect for basic democratic freedoms, respect for international institutions and norms that we have shaped to promote a safer and more prosperous future.

When we fail to call out egregious offenses—the slaughter of innocent civilians, the murder of American resident and journalist Jamal Khashoggi, the effective kidnapping of heads of state, just to name a few—we contribute to the steady erosion of fundamental freedoms and values that have driven us to a position of global strength.

This resolution is a clear message that if the President of the United States will not stand up in defense of our values, we in the U.S. Senate will. When this President selectively condemns some violations one day and then inexplicably ignores them and condones them another day, the Congress will act as an effective check and balance. As a coequal branch of government, we will defend American values, and we will work to promote our long-term security interests.

At the end of the day, the Saudi Government must take responsibility for its actions, for this ugly war does not serve Saudi Arabia's own long-term interests.

Achieving a path toward stability and prosperity demands that the Saudi Government hold itself to a higher standard. It must treat its citizens with dignity and respect. It must engage its partners in the region in responsible efforts to protect its borders from ever-growing Iranian threats. Shortsighted, capricious actions will not serve Saudi Arabia's long-term interests.

Yes, the United States has an important relationship with Saudi Arabia. But we must also be true to our own long-term interests, and that means we cannot sit idly by, waiting for the Crown Prince and the Saudi Government to act. It should be clear to everyone in this body that the resolution we are considering today is just one part of this effort.

I am proud to have worked across party lines with Senators YOUNG, REED, GRAHAM, and others in introducing the comprehensive Saudi Arabia Accountability and Yemen Act. This bill calls for a limited suspension of offensive weapons sales to Saudi Arabia, prohibits U.S. refueling of Saudi coalition aircraft engaged in Yemen, sanctions persons blocking humanitarian

access in Yemen, sanctions persons supporting the Houthis in Yemen, mandates Global Magnitsky sanctions on persons responsible for the death of American resident Jamal Khashoggi.

Unfortunately, we have not been able to get to this legislation in the timeframe that we have, but let me be clear. We will continue to work at it, and we do not want to see a weak substitute that degrades the intent of tangible action from the Senate.

I hope, after we get through this important vote on this resolution, at the end of the day—whether it be in this Congress or the next—that the only thing we do with reference to Jamal Khashoggi is not simply an expression of our outrage. We need to do something far more than that if we are going to send a global message. The time for waiting and posturing is over.

This administration has made abundantly and disappointingly clear that it will not act unless we force it to. President Trump has made clear over and over again that the only way he takes the high road is if he is dragged up to it, kicking and screaming. Taking their cue, the Saudis at this moment see no incentive to change their behavior. It is time for the Senate to act. It is time to stand up for the very values that define us as a nation.

The passage of the Sanders-Lee resolution should signal to the world that the U.S. Senate should hold Saudi Arabia accountable—including the royal family. We will continue to demand that we consider additional measures to make clear what we stand for as a nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his concern about this issue. I voted to dispense with this out of the committee. I have concerns about the particular legal issues that are being created here, but I wanted this debate to take place on the floor.

I thank him for his concerns about the way the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia is conducting himself, about the war itself, and how ham-handed the Saudis and others have been, having shown so little concern for the citizens who live in Yemen. So I appreciate his efforts.

I know we are very unlikely to come to an agreement on the bill he has offered, and I can understand why he would rather start the next year with a bill that he feels is stronger. I have some operational concerns, but I like the thrust of it very much.

I understand that, knowing we are not going to come to a conclusion this year, he would rather start this next Congress with the strongest message and bill that he can put forth. But I do want to thank him for offering it. I hope that—again, with some operational concerns worked out from my perspective—it comes along. I hope the thrust of it comes along.



So I thank him for that, and I thank him for his concern for the people of Yemen. I thank him, in particular, for his tremendous disdain for what the Crown Prince has done relative to the journalist.

The Senator is right that expressing outrage in itself is not enough; I agree with that 100 percent. I do hope that once this is done, so we don't confuse that with what is happening here on this particular message, if you will, that is taking place—he is right that it is not going to change policy. The only thing that will change policy is a refined Menendez-Young bill that will be dealt with next year. But I do hope we will have the ability, after this is over, after this is dispensed with tomorrow—I hope we can speak to that outrage. I think it helps us. As it relates to the second Magnitsky letter that we sent, I think it helps reinforce the fact that we hold him accountable, and I think there could be some good there.

I also think, as it relates to Saudi Arabia, a strong admonishment of the Crown Prince—I think they care about that a whole lot more than we might think.

So I wish the Senator well as we move ahead with the other piece. I would like to see some changes. I will not be here to make those happen, but I thank him for the thrust. I appreciate the message that is being put forth now. I do hope that, collectively, before we leave here this year, we can admonish strongly what we believe the Crown Prince has been involved in, and that is the murder of a journalist.

Mr. MENENDEZ. If my friend the distinguished chairman of the committee will yield for a moment, let me just say first that I appreciate his good intentions and commitment to having a process in which the Sanders-Lee resolution could move forward. To keep it within a germane sphere, I know that was one of the things the Senator said very early on, which I embrace, and I am glad for his leadership in that regard. I think passing this will be important, and I urge all of our colleagues to vote for it.

I look forward to when he presents the resolution he has talked about with reference to the Crown Prince. I do think that if he brings that forward, it is likely something I will support because I think it is important to make it very clear that you cannot kill with impunity just because you are our ally and that human rights and democracy are still values that we—at least in the U.S. Senate—believe are an integral part of our foreign policy. Countries that observe human rights and democracy and share our deepest values at the end of the day are our most reliable allies and are less likely to drag us into conflicts in other places. So I look forward to that debate and discussion when the distinguished Senator offers that.

But I will reiterate—and I appreciate the Senator's somewhat endorsement with some reservations. It is critical—

I know Senator YOUNG is standing; I will cease in a moment—that we need to do more—even though I will probably embrace what the Senator is doing—than just say we are outraged that the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia is complicit in the killing of Jamal Khashoggi.

There is a long list of things the Crown Prince has already done beyond that, some of which I mentioned in my remarks. But at the end of the day, if all we do is express our outrage, then anybody in the world, any leader in the world, any country we have a relationship with could say: Well, they will publicly slap us on the wrist, but that will be the total consequence.

If that is the total consequence, then at the end of the day, people will act with impunity. When they do that, we go down a dangerous path, not just for those who live in those countries and may be subjected to those types of indiscriminate executions and other gross violations of human rights; we send a global message that is a downward spiral. That is what I and some of my colleagues I am going to join briefly to talk about—we intend to pursue this in the next Congress—want to see happen. I appreciate that the Senator supports that sentiment, and I look forward to continuing to work with him until the very end of this session.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, before yielding to Senator YOUNG so he can make his amendment pending, I just want to follow up and say—look, I do want to go on record and say that I support the provisions of the Senator's bill that block for a period of time offensive weaponry sales to Saudi Arabia. I support that. I also support provisions of the bill that sanction people who are blocking humanitarian aid for the people there.

The Senator and his staff know we have some operational issues, and I know those are going to get worked out. I know that the way to start legislation and get it to where we really want it to be is to start out strongly. I know the Senator knows he is not going to pass it this year, and if I were the Senator from New Jersey, I would go about it exactly the way he is going about it.

So I do appreciate the thrust, and I do hope we pass those into law with some of the other provisions so that there is a price to pay for what has taken place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 4080

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 4080.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. YOUNG] proposes an amendment numbered 4080.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4080

(Purpose: To clarify that this resolution prohibits United States Armed Forces from refueling non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen)

On page 4, line 21, add after the period at the end the following: "For purposes of this resolution, in this section, the term 'hostilities' includes in-flight refueling of non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 4080 to S.J. Res. 54. I introduced this amendment this morning, and I am proud to report that Senators Shaheen, Collins, and Coons are now cosponsoring this important bipartisan amendment.

Amendment No. 4080 would amend S.J. Res. 54 by simply defining the term "hostilities" to include "in-flight refueling of non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen." In other words, this amendment would prevent the resumption of U.S. air refueling of Saudi coalition aircraft in Yemen—those very aircraft that, in too many instances, have been responsible for indiscriminate bombing and violations of international human rights law. That is all this amendment would accomplish. It does not define the term "hostilities" more broadly for the War Powers Resolution or in any other instance.

Before discussing the amendment in more detail, allow me to zoom out for a moment and explain how I see the broader picture related to Saudi Arabia and Yemen.

The civil war in Yemen, as so many now know, is an unmitigated national security and humanitarian disaster. The longer the civil war continues, the more influential Iran and various terrorist groups will become in Yemen. Meanwhile, approximately 14 million people are on the verge of famine, and it is getting worse by the day.

Famine and the indiscriminate targeting of civilians by the Saudi-led coalition will only push more Yemenis toward Iran and toward its proxies, giving terrorists increasing opportunities to threaten Americans, our partners, and our interests. So it is essential to America's national security interests, as well as our humanitarian principles, that the administration use all available leverage to end the civil war in Yemen without delay.

The only way to end this civil war and make significant and durable progress on the humanitarian crisis is through an inclusive political process. Everyone agrees on this. It is positive that the parties to the conflict are talking in Sweden as part of the U.N. envoy-led peace process. We want that process to succeed. I know the administration supports these talks, and I commend them for the encouragement of these talks. There are many potential pitfalls in the peace process, though, so we have to do all we can to support this effort here in Congress.

Since March of 2017, I sought to underscore the importance of the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and to provide this administration leverage that it can use to pressure the Saudis to support an urgent and good-faith effort to end the civil war and to stop using food as a weapon of war.

In that effort, I have used every available tool at my disposal as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That has included, for example, a resolution that was passed by the Senate, legislation passed into law, subcommittee hearings, letters, and even a hold on the nomination of our former Secretary of State's top lawyer at the Department of State. That was before the administration understood, as they do now, the importance of having a negotiated political settlement between all the parties.

But as I have provided additional leverage to the administration over a period of time, we have to acknowledge that the civil war has continued, the world's worst humanitarian crisis has deteriorated further, Iran's influence has only increased, and the Saudi Crown Prince has, unfortunately, been left with the impression that he can get away with almost anything, including murder.

To be clear, with or without amendment No. 4080, S.J. Res. 54 may never become law. Even in that case, I believe adoption of amendment No. 4080 today would send an even stronger message at a critical moment to our Saudi partners that we expect them to do everything in their power to end this civil war.

Some may argue that no additional pressure is needed. I have heard that argument. I reject that argument, and here is why. On October 30, Secretaries Pompeo and Mattis called for a cease-fire in Yemen within 30 days. Those 30 days—for those who are checking your calendar—came and went on November 29. Yet the Saudi coalition has continued airstrikes.

I have a hard time believing that if Secretary Mattis picked up the phone and told Riyadh to knock off the airstrikes in Yemen, the Saudis would ignore him. If that call hasn't occurred, there may be a problem. If it has and the Saudis have ignored that demand, then, that may be a problem. Either way, we may have a big problem on our hands.

It is not in our national security interest to sit idly by as the Saudis ignore the clear demands of our Secretaries of Defense and State, especially when we are members of the coalition. Our taxpayers are funding these military exercises that are exacerbating the worst humanitarian crisis in generations and that are destabilizing a country where Iran, al Qaida, and ISIS have a foothold.

Let's support our Secretaries of State and Defense. Let's support them in their efforts. Let's give this administration yet more leverage vis-a-vis the Saudis.

The number of innocent people confronting famine is growing by the day. Innocent people are being bombed. Iran and terror groups are benefiting from the status quo. The Saudis have ignored our Secretaries' call for a cease-fire. My question to my colleagues here on Capitol Hill who are still undecided about how they might vote with respect to this amendment that I am bringing up is this: What are we going to do about it? What are you going to do about it today, because you have an opportunity to do something about it?

I will say that today, even if this resolution does not become law, we can take an important step and send the right message to Riyadh. There is no doubt that the Houthis have engaged in absolutely abhorrent behavior in Yemen, and, then, it takes two sides to negotiate.

We don't have much leverage over the Houthis. We have significant leverage over the Saudis, and we must utilize it. If S.J. Res. 54 does become law, my amendment would ensure that it accomplishes its stated purpose with respect to air refueling.

Some may continue to argue that the United States is not engaged in hostilities in Yemen. It is a war. Our taxpayers are providing funding. There is intelligence support and logistical support and refueling of aircraft carrying bombs, but some will argue that we are not engaged in hostilities in Yemen. In other words, this Senate joint resolution, absent my amendment, risks leaving the status quo in place in Yemen. With my amendment, the legislation would ensure that the administration cannot resume refueling of Saudi aircraft conducting missions related to this civil war.

To those principled colleagues—and there are a number of principled colleagues on this issue—who are conversant on the issue and have been studying it for a great deal of time, I have great respect for them. I know there is at least one who is concerned about any precedents we may be creating relating to the War Powers Resolution or other situations. Let me be clear. My amendment explicitly says this definition for hostilities only applies to this resolution we are considering today and only to this case.

I will also reiterate that my amendment would not restrict U.S. refueling on our own aircraft and would not restrict refueling of other aircraft for missions focused on al-Qaida and associated forces. We have it covered. Either way, Senators looking to send the right message today to the Saudis and those looking to change the situation in Yemen should support amendment No. 4080.

For a very quick word on the War Powers Resolution—the underlying resolution—here again, principled and serious people are on both sides of the War Powers Resolution debate, and I see merits on both sides of that argument. The President is indeed the Commander in Chief. That said, the Found-

ers also establish clear article I constitutional war powers and responsibilities for Congress.

For me, today, in this situation, and only with respect to Yemen, I believe a reasonable reading of the Constitution leaves plenty of room for a "yes" vote on this resolution. Our humanitarian principles and national security interests require it. With that, I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 4080 and to support passage of the underlying resolution and send a message to Riyadh.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, through the Presiding Officer I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana, what you are saying is that you are doing everything you possibly can do to ensure that if your amendment passes, never in the future will your amendment be relied upon to say if we are refueling, that means we are involved in hostilities; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the chairman for the clarification so that I can further clarify for the record that this amendment only applies for purposes of this resolution and in the section I offered it.

Let's say in Mali, for example, that our country in the future were involved with refueling operations of our partner or our ally's aircraft. This wouldn't apply. This would establish absolutely no precedent.

We have had national security legal counsel look at this. We have taken a belt-and-suspenders approach. No reasonable reading of this could construe this to establish any legal precedent that ought to cause concern for anyone concerned.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask again the Senator: For those of us, many in this body, including the Senator from Indiana, who worry that the mere refueling that may take place in Mali, where maybe we are supporting French troops, or the refueling in other places—the mere refueling in another country, the mere refueling itself—you are saying that by voting for your amendment, you have no intention of ever creating a precedent that another Senator could use the War Powers Act simply because of refueling taking place; is that your intention?

Mr. YOUNG. My intention is to only address the situation in Yemen, and that is precisely what this amendment does—nothing more, nothing less.

Back to the example of Mali and French aircraft, there would be absolutely no application of this amendment to that conflict, to the refueling of those aircraft or to our own aircraft. That is why we have doubled up on clarifying precautionary language, so that no one could conceivably construe that in any legal analysis that makes any level of common sense or legal sense, because the two don't always seem to be consistent. But we have had attorneys look at this, and it applies narrowly only to this context.



I will entertain any more questions, but I feel as though I am restating this. It is a very important matter. So I am glad the Chairman gave me an opportunity to answer it.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Indiana answering those questions. Today, we are, as you know, establishing precedent on a number of things. No. 1, we overwhelmingly decided that if the War Powers Resolution is used in this matter, only germane amendments can be put forth. I think that was a big step forward as it relates to this type of debate and in using the War Powers Resolution as it is being used.

I did want to get the Senate record to be very clear that the Senator from Indiana, should his amendment pass, was in no way trying to create a scenario where if we are refueling someplace, that automatically means we are involved in hostilities. What he is trying to do is address this specific issue.

Since we have been able to have this in the RECORD and since, hopefully, future Senates will rely upon the RECORD to look at what is taking place today, I want to thank the Senator for his amendment and tell him that I plan to support it.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this has been the center of a lot of discussion, and it is a little confusing. I think there are a lot of things that everyone in here agrees with, but how we are going to express ourselves has to come down to all possibilities of the options that are there.

I want to start off by saying that I oppose the Sanders-Lee provision. I think the resolution would have us find that since March of 2015, members of the U.S. Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities in Yemen between the Saudi-led coalition and Houthis, including providing to the Saudi-led coalition aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and midflight aerial refueling.

If enacted, Lee-Sanders could ultimately pull all U.S. support from the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen. The Sanders-Lee resolution is, I think, fundamentally flawed because it presumes we are engaged in military action in Yemen. We are not. We are not engaged in military action in Yemen.

There has been a lot of discussion about refueling. I don't see any stretch of the definition that would say that falls into that category. The truth is that with the exception of the defense strike in October 2016, the U.S. Armed Forces are not engaged in direct military action in Yemen.

The limited military support and intelligence sharing being provided by the United States to the Saudi-led coalition does not involve the introduction of U.S. Forces into hostilities, nor is the U.S. involvement in hostilities imminent given the circumstances at hand.

U.S. forces in support of the coalition do not currently command, coordinate, accompany, or participate in the movement of Saudi coalition forces in the counter-Houthi operations.

As of November 11 of this year, the U.S. Armed Forces ceased refueling support. That is no longer an issue. Even if it were an issue, this is not one that would constitute the category we have been talking about.

As for the Saudi coalition, the counter-Houthi operations in Yemen, even if the refueling support we were providing were going on today, it would not constitute involvement in hostilities. For that reason, I do oppose it.

I don't know which of these resolutions is actually going to be on the floor for a vote and in what order they would be on the floor, but the resolution that has been put together by Senator CORKER and our leader I think is the best solution to the problem we are confronted with now.

Like many of my colleagues, I was deeply disturbed by the killing of the Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi at Saudi Arabia's consulate in Istanbul in October. I deplore everything in conjunction with that. While it may not be a smoking gun as such, I believe that Saudi Arabia's leadership is responsible for Mr. Khashoggi's death.

Those responsible are going to have to be held accountable, and we must condemn this terrible and unaccepted event. That is clearly what the resolution says.

The resolution also acknowledges the Trump administration's important decision to sanction 17 Saudis for their roles in Mr. Khashoggi's murder.

At the same time, Saudi Arabia is an important Middle Eastern partner. Its stability is vital to the security of our regional allies and our partners, including Israel, and Saudi Arabia is essential to countering Iran. We all know that. We know how tenuous things are in that part of the world. We don't have that many friends. We can't afford to lose any of them.

While we must be frank with our partners and let them know when they have done, in our opinion, something wrong, we must be cautious and avoid steps that would damage a strategic relationship that goes back over half a century. For this reason, I am hoping that the resolution will be introduced, in which case I will be supporting the resolution the leader and Senator CORKER have introduced. It criticizes the Saudi Government for its recent behavior and encourages it to get on the right path—the right path to redouble its reform efforts, the right path to respect the rights of its citizens, and the right path to work toward a peaceful resolution in Yemen.

You know, I don't like any of the choices we have. This is clearly the best choice that is out there.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join many of my colleagues in support of passage of the underlying resolution. I was pleased to be one of the original cosponsors, along with the Presiding Officer and Senator SANDERS, amongst many others.

This is clearly not the first time I have been to the floor to talk about the crisis inside Yemen and the broader crisis with respect to our relationship with Saudi Arabia that has grown worse and worse, especially in the last several months.

I want to thank Senator MENENDEZ and Senator CORKER for taking this incredibly seriously, especially since the death of Jamal Khashoggi, who was a resident of the United States here, ostensibly under our protection. I am hopeful that we will get another big bipartisan vote when this comes up for final passage.

I want to reiterate some of the reasons I think this is incredibly important.

First, let me state what I hope is obvious even for those of us who have been critics of Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia is a very important ally of the United States. It is an important partner for stability in the region. We continue to engage in an important counterterrorism, intelligence-sharing relationship with Saudi Arabia. They have helped us track down some very bad people. We have helped them track down some very bad people. Sunni extremists—separate and aside from the argument as to where that movement gets some of its seed funding—are out to get the Saudi regime, just as they are out to get the United States.

Second, it is important to note something that we take for granted in the region—this now long-term detente that has existed between the Gulf States and Israel, which did not used to be something you could rely on. In fact, one of the most serious foreign policy debates this Senate ever had was on the sale of AWACS to Saudi Arabia back in the 1980s. The objection then was that by empowering Saudi Arabia, you were hurting Israel and Israeli security. No one would make that argument today because Saudi Arabia has been a good partner in trying to figure out a way to calm the tensions in the region and, of course, provide some balance in the region, with the Iranian regime on the other side continuing to this day to use inflammatory and dangerous rhetoric about the future of Israel.

So this is an important partnership, and I have no interest in blowing it up. I have no interest in walking away from it. But you are not obligated to follow your friend into every misadventure they propose. When your buddy jumps into a pool of man-eating sharks, you don't have to jump with him. There is a point at which you say enough is enough. I came to this floor 3 years ago and suggested that time had already come.

Muhammad bin Salman, who is the Crown Prince, who is the effective leader of the country, has steered the foreign policy of Saudi Arabia off the rails. Folks seem to have noticed when he started rounding up his political opponents and killing one of them in a consulate in Turkey, but this has been ongoing. Look back to the kidnapping of the Lebanese Prime Minister, the blockade of Qatar without any heads-up to the United States, the wholesale imprisonment of hundreds of his family members until there was a payoff, the size of which was big enough to let some of them out.

This is a foreign policy that is no longer in the best interests of the United States and cannot be papered over by a handful of domestic policy reforms that are, in fact, intended to try to distract us from the aggressive nature of the Saudis' foreign policy in the region.

Of course, the worst example of their regional behavior going off the rails is Yemen. And I don't want to restate the case here; I think Senator SANDERS did a great job of it.

I have stood here before with posters of malnourished children with distended bellies. Some 85,000 of them have died from malnutrition or disease. The world's worst ever outbreak of cholera is happening right now as we speak. Ten thousand Yemenis have died from warfare, from bombings, or from siege campaigns. About two-thirds to three-quarters of those were as a result of the Saudi side of the civil war, but let's make clear that there are some really bad actors on the Houthi side as well. Part of the reason the humanitarian aid can't get to where it is needs to get to is because the Houthis are stopping it from getting into the areas they control today. So the Saudis bear the majority of the responsibility for the humanitarian nightmare, but there is enough to be spread around.

I am appreciative that many of my colleagues are willing to stand up for this resolution today to end the war in Yemen. I wish that it weren't because of the death of one journalist, because there have been tens of thousands who have died inside Yemen, and their lives are just as important and just as worthwhile as Jamal Khashoggi's life was, as tragic as that was. But there is a connection between the two, which is why I have actually argued that this resolution is in some way, shape, or form a response to the death of Jamal Khashoggi, for those who are primarily concerned with that atrocity. Here is how I link the two:

What the Saudis did for 2 weeks was lie to us, right? In the most bald-faced way possible. They told us that Jamal Khashoggi had left the consulate, that he had gotten out of there alive, that they didn't know what happened, when of course they knew the entire time that they had killed him, that they had murdered him, that they had dismembered his body. We now know that the Crown Prince had multiple con-

tacts all throughout the day with the team of operatives who did it. Yet they thought we were so dumb or so weak—or some combination of the two—that they could just lie to us about it.

That was an eye-opener for a lot of people here who were long-term supporters of the Saudi relationship because they knew that we had trouble. They knew that sometimes our interests didn't align, but they thought that the most important thing allies did with each other was tell the truth, especially when the truth was so easy to discover outside of your bilateral relationship. Then, all of a sudden, the Saudis lied to us for 2 weeks—for 2 weeks—and then finally came around to telling the truth because everybody knew that they weren't.

That made a lot of people here think, well, wait a second—maybe the Saudis haven't been telling us the truth about what they have been doing inside Yemen.

A lot of my friends have been supporting the bombing campaign in Yemen. Why? Because the Saudis said: We are hitting these civilians by accident. Those water treatment plants that have been blowing up—we didn't mean to hit them. That cholera treatment facility inside the humanitarian compound—that was just a bomb that went into the wrong place, or, we thought there were some bad guys in it. It didn't turn out that there were.

It turns out the Saudis weren't telling us the truth about what they were doing in Yemen. They were hitting civilian targets on purpose. They did have an intentional campaign of trying to create misery. I am not saying that every single one of those schoolbuses or those hospitals or those churches or weddings was an attempt to kill civilians and civilians only, but we have been in that targeting center long enough to know—to know—that they have known for a long time what they have been doing: hitting a lot of people who have nothing to do with the attacks against Saudi Arabia.

Maybe if the Saudis were willing to lie to us about what happened to Jamal Khashoggi, they haven't been straight with us as to what is happening inside Yemen, because if the United States is being used to intentionally hit civilians, then we are complicit in war crimes. And I hate to tell my colleagues that is essentially what the United Nations found in their most recent report on the Saudi bombing campaign. They were careful about their words, but they came to the conclusion that it was likely that the Saudi conduct inside Yemen would amount to war crimes under international law.

If it is likely that our ally is perpetuating war crimes in Yemen, then we cannot be a part of that. The United States cannot be part of a bombing campaign that may be—probably is—intentionally making life miserable for the people inside of that country.

So I would argue that this resolution is an appropriate response if you are

only concerned about Jamal Khashoggi because it is a way to make clear that if you lie to the United States, there are consequences. It is also a way to say to the Crown Prince: We are not going to be partners with you in your most important foreign policy endeavor—the war inside Yemen—if you are not being straight with us about this or other matters.

If you care just about what happened to that journalist, this is still an important vote for you to cast. And I get it that some people have issues with the mechanism by which we get here, the War Powers Resolution. I understand that it is new, that it hasn't been tested before. But I believe this is the right moment to have this debate and to have this vote.

I am hoping that we are going to come to a conclusion here as quickly as we can in which we maintain bipartisan consensus. I just joined several of my colleagues upstairs to express our desire—this isn't the beginning and the end of our debate about what to do with Saudi Arabia moving forward. I support Senator MENENDEZ and Senator YOUNG's legislation to take some additional steps to halt arms sales. I support imposing sanctions on the individuals who are responsible for this crime. But I would also hope that all of us take a little bit of time over the holidays to really think about how we reset this relationship in the region and how we send a signal to the world that there is no relationship in which we are the junior partner—certainly not with Saudi Arabia.

If Saudi Arabia can push us around like they have over the course of the last several years and in particular the last several months, that sends a signal to lots of other countries that they can do the same thing—that they can murder U.S. residents and suffer almost no consequences; that they can bomb civilians with our munitions and suffer no consequences.

This is not just a message about the Saudi relationship; this is a message about how the United States is going to interact with lots of other junior partners around the world as well. Saudi Arabia needs us a lot more than we need them, and we need to remind folks of that over and over again.

Spare me this nonsense that they are going to go start buying Russian jets or Chinese military hardware. If you think those countries can protect you better than the United States, take a chance. You think the Saudis are really going to stop selling oil to the United States? You think they are going to walk away from their primary bread winner just because we say that we don't want to be engaged in this particular military campaign? I am willing to take that chance.

We are the major partner in this relationship, and it is time that we start acting like it. If this administration isn't going to act like it, then this Congress has to act like it. As Senator GRAHAM said, sometimes Congress has

to go its own way. Sometimes Congress has to reorient American foreign policy when an administration will not.

With respect to this bilateral relationship, with respect to this egregious, unconscionable military operation inside Yemen, it is time for Congress to step up and right something that today is very, very wrong.

I appreciate all of the great work that Senator SANDERS and Senator LEE have done as partners in this, and I thank the chairman and ranking member for helping guide us through this debate as painlessly as possible. I look forward to coming to the floor again before final passage and look forward to another big bipartisan vote at the end of this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I take this time to support the passage of S.J. Res. 54. I commend my colleagues who have brought this resolution forward. The impact of this resolution would be to end the U.S. military engagement in Yemen, and I believe that military engagement should end for several reasons.

First, let me comment on what others have already pointed out, and that is that the humanitarian crisis in Yemen is one of the worst, if not the worst, in the world. That is saying a lot because there are a lot of areas around the world where we are seeing humanitarian challenges.

In Yemen today, 10,000 people have been killed due to the war, and 22 million-plus—75 percent of the population in Yemen—are at grave risk today. It is estimated that there are 400,000 children under the age of 5 who are at the risk of starvation due to hunger and malnutrition, and 85,000 children have died, according to Save the Children, from starvation.

The U.S. military engagement has really not assisted in ending this humanitarian crisis. There are 1 million people with cholera and 8.4 million people on the verge of famine. For a long time, we have been, focused on the Port of Hodeidah, saying that it had to be opened in order to be able to deliver humanitarian assistance. I think many of us thought that because of our military involvement in Yemen, at a minimum, we could get the port open. We find we are not able to have safe routes for the delivery of humanitarian assistance, so through our military we have not been able to impact the horrible tragedies that are taking place because of this humanitarian disaster.

Secondly, I think most experts will tell us there is no military solution to the war that is taking place in Yemen that dates back to 2014. The warring sides are not going to end as a result of the military. It is going to take diplomacy, and our military involvement has not assisted in a diplomatic answer. We have not made the progress I think many of us would have expected.

So, yes, I do believe America needs to be engaged in Yemen, just not from our military. Let's do an all-out press on diplomacy and bring the parties to the peace table and end this horrible conflict.

Yes, make no mistake about it, the Houthis are not nice people. I understand that, but we are not going to win this by our military. So let's concentrate on diplomacy. I think many have pointed out that, yes, we have been in this region since the attack on our country on September 11. Nothing in this resolution would affect our ability to fight against al-Qaida and its associated forces.

The resolution specifically exempts—specifically exempts—from the withdrawal of American military our campaign against al-Qaida and associated forces.

There is also no question that since the Saudis have engaged in this conflict, there have been many violations of human rights. Yes, we are facilitating and helping. I am not saying we are committing, but we are certainly part of the Saudi effort. We are supposedly helping them with targeting. That means giving them intelligence information to minimize civilian casualties. I am certain the American military is helping in that regard, but the bottom line is, we are told that 61 percent of casualties are due to coalition strikes. There is tremendous civilian loss as a result of this campaign, and the United States is one of the honest brokers in trying to minimize that. We have not been successful through the use of our military.

The use of our military has never been authorized by Congress. Now, this is a debate we have had many times. I know the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been part of that debate and has wanted us to come to grips with a congressional authorization for military use in Yemen. I applaud the chairman. I am very proud to be on that committee. I think if it were left up to our committee, we may have been able to agree on a resolution, but it was clear we couldn't get it through the Senate, couldn't get it through the Congress. That was clear. I am not saying we are culpable for not passing authorization, but we have not passed authorization, and there is no authorization for the use of military force in Yemen, despite the fact that article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution of the United States gives the Congress the sole power to declare war.

We are responsible for the military, and if you can't get that authorization, there should at least be a presumption that we shouldn't be using our military. If you can't get the support of Congress—if the President, Commander in Chief, can't get the support of Congress for the use of force, there should not be a sustained use. We know about emergency situations. We expect it of the Commander in Chief. This is not an emergency situation. This is a situa-

tion where there should be an authorization for the use of force if we are to remain. I don't believe we should remain.

We have had our disagreements with the President on the use of force. Congress passed the War Powers Act in 1973. The President didn't like it. We passed it anyway. We believe the President should not only notify but respect the will of Congress's power under article I to declare war and authorize our military presence.

Section 5(c) gives the power to Congress to pass a joint resolution to remove our troops where there has been no authorization. So what is being done today—the resolution that is before us—is the vehicle that we determined to be the appropriate way to remove our troops from unauthorized war. Therefore, it is an appropriate action by the Congress—probably the only action we can take in order to end the war in Yemen with U.S. participation.

I want to make a comment about the relationship between the United States and the Saudis. I heard many of my colleagues talk about it. I think it is a very important relationship. I think the Saudis are a strategic partner of the United States. I had many opportunities to visit with the Saudis. I know about a lot of the things they are doing, but make no mistake about it, that relationship is important to the United States, but it is very important to the Saudis. It is more than just our military support for a war in Yemen. It has a lot to do with security issues generally. It has to do with intelligence sharing. It has to do with economics.

Our relationship should always be wrapped in our values. Our foreign policy should always be based upon our values as Americans, and our values in regard to what is happening in this war in Yemen tell us we should not be participating in it.

I haven't even mentioned the tragic death of Jamal Khashoggi. When taking a look at what happened there and the involvement of the royal family and the Crown Prince, that clearly cannot go unchallenged. Human rights violations and the military campaign, all of that cries out for the United States not to be engaged in the military aspects of what is happening in Yemen, and the passage of S.J. Res. 54 will, in fact, make that a reality, and I urge our colleagues to support that resolution.

TIME MAGAZINE'S PERSON OF THE YEAR

Mr. President, it is a related subject.

I am going to talk about TIME magazine for their selection of their Person of the Year, the "Guardians and the War on Truth." I say it is related because Jamal Khashoggi is one of the figures that is on the cover of TIME magazine as one of the guardians.

In making their selection, TIME magazine wrote: "For taking great risks in pursuit of greater truths, for the imperfect but essential quest for

facts that are central to civil discourse, for speaking up and for speaking out, the Guardians” are the Person of the Year.

TIME magazine wrote:

As we looked at the choices, it became clear that the manipulation and abuse of truth is really the common thread in so many of this year’s major stories . . . this ought to be a time when democracy leaps forward, an informed citizenry being essential to self-government. Instead, it’s in retreat. And the story of this assault on truth is, somewhat paradoxically, one of the hardest to tell.

TIME magazine wrote in this week’s issue:

In Annapolis, Md., staff of the Capital, a newspaper published by Capital Gazette Communications, which traces its history of telling readers about the events in Maryland to before the American Revolution, press on without the five colleagues gunned down in their newsroom on June 28. Still intact, indeed strengthened after the mass shooting, are the bonds of trust and community that for national news outlets have been eroded on strikingly partisan lines, never more than this year.

“I can tell you this,” declared Chase Cook, a reporter for the Capital Gazette [on that fateful day]. “We are putting out a damn paper tomorrow.” Cook’s promise . . . came just a few hours after five of his colleagues were killed. The man charged with their murders had been obsessed with the paper since it wrote about his harassment of a high school classmate—part of its routine coverage of local legal proceedings. He made the office a crime scene. To put the damn paper out, staffers set up laptops in the bed of a pickup in a parking garage across the street.

When the next edition arrived—on schedule—the opinion page was blank but for the names of the dead. Gerald Fischman. Rob Hiaasen. John McNamara. Rebecca Smith. Wendi Winters. Beneath their names was . . . written with a goose quill: “Tomorrow this page will return to its steady purpose of offering our readers informed opinions about the world around them, that they might be better citizens.”

I must tell you I am very proud of what the Capital Gazette has done. They continued through very difficult times with the quality reporting and opinion pages they have been known for, for a long time—a real treasured institution in our State’s capital.

One of the four TIME magazine covers includes the journalists of the Capital Gazette, the Annapolis, MD, newspaper where five employees were murdered by a gunman last June.

I spoke about this shooting on the Senate floor last June, and the Senate unanimously adopted S. Res. 575, which I authored and which was cosponsored by all Members of the Senate. This Senate resolution commemorates the lives, careers, and service of five victims of the Capital Gazette shooting in Annapolis, MD; honors the survivors of the attack and the families of the victims and pledges to continue support for their recovery; thanks law enforcement officers and other emergency first responders for their heroic actions; and reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to defending the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Wendi Winters was among the five Capital Gazette employees killed in the June 28 shooting. According to eyewitness accounts from survivors, Wendi armed herself with the closest weapons at hand—her trash and recycling bins—and charged the shooter, shouting for him to stop. It is believed Wendi’s actions distracted the shooter enough to enable several of her coworkers to escape.

We think of violence against reporters as something that happens in other countries, in war zones and the like, but not here, not in the United States of America. All around the world, reporters work to gather facts, ask questions, and report the news in the spirit of free, open, and transparent societies and governments that all people deserve. Too often, reporters are harassed, jailed, and even killed simply because of the nature of their work, which often exposes cronyism and corruption.

Jason Rezaian, a reporter with the Washington Post who was falsely imprisoned in Iran for doing his job as a journalist, had this to say earlier this year. He talks about the attack I referenced earlier in Annapolis.

Mostly I have covered attacks on the media taking place on the other side of the world, usually in countries where the flow of information is restricted or conditions are such that a sense of desperation or political or tribal affiliation can compel individuals to take heinous action. . . . Writing about a deadly attack that happened less than 30 miles away, in an idyllic town that I recently visited with relatives from overseas, is a new experience for me. And I have to say that I don’t relish the task.

We Americans have certain rights and responsibilities granted to us through the Constitution, which established the rule of law in this country. Freedom of the press is one of those most basic rights, and it is central to the First Amendment of the Constitution: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.” This precious freedom has often been under attack, figuratively speaking, since our Nation’s founding.

Today, attacks on the American media have become more frequent and more literal, spurred on by dangerous rhetoric that has created an “open season” on harassing the media for doing its job—asking the questions that need to be asked, investigating the stories that need to be uncovered, and bringing needed transparency to the halls of power, whether they are in Annapolis, Washington, DC, or elsewhere.

Then-candidate and now-President Trump’s rhetoric—calling the media “a stain on America” and “the enemy of the American people”—certainly has caused damage. At the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the President said to the audience that they are “not to believe” what they see and hear. The President of the United States told a crowd of veterans:

Stick with us. Don’t believe the crap you see from these people, the fake news. . . . What you’re seeing and what you’re reading is not what’s happening.

That is the President of the United States saying those comments—again, demeaning the press and the importance of the free press.

Why is the President doing this? Earlier this year, CBS “60 Minutes” correspondent Leslie Stahl, an icon in the news business, shared comments from President Trump from an interview she did with him soon after the 2016 election win. Stahl recalled that she said to Donald Trump about his attacks on the media:

Why are you doing this? You’re doing it over and over. It’s boring and it’s time to end that.

The candidate’s response was straightforward and shocking. He said:

You know why I do it? I do it to discredit you all and demean you all so that when you write negative stories about me no one will believe you.

Let that sink in for a moment. A man who was about to assume the position of President of the United States explicitly acknowledged he was purposefully working to diminish the integrity of the free press.

After the Capitol Gazette shooting, Donald Trump said: “Journalists, like all Americans, should be free from the fear of being violently attacked while doing their job.” But how do we interpret his sincerity when, more frequently, he is calling the media “fake news” or “totally unhinged” and telling the people of America that reporters are truly bad people?

Donald Trump’s constant dismissal needs to end. He needs to accept that one of the press’s most important roles is to speak truth to power—truth to power, including to the President of the United States.

Here at home, we are left to wonder whether Donald Trump is more inclined to agree with Russian President Vladimir Putin’s view of the press—where journalists are routinely jailed and physically attacked—than with Thomas Jefferson, who famously said: “Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.”

Journalists, like all Americans, should be free from the fear of being violently attacked while doing their job—both figuratively and literally. The right of journalists to report the news is nothing less than the right of all of us to know. Media freedom and media pluralism are essential for the expression of, or ensuring respect for, other fundamental freedoms and safeguarding democracy, the rule of law, and a system of checks and balances.

Every one of us in this body—Democrats and Republicans—has sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. As leaders of this great Nation, we have a responsibility to defend the rights of our

citizens, including the freedom of press.

Yesterday, *TIME* magazine featured three covers in addition to the *Capital Gazette*. One is Jamal Khashoggi, the *Washington Post* contributor who was killed at the Saudi Arabian Consulate in Istanbul in October. I would note that this is the first time that a *TIME* Person of the Year is a deceased person.

The United States of America must stand up for justice and human rights at home and abroad. I agree that Saudi Arabia is a strong ally in a variety of important areas, but that should only strengthen their understanding of America's commitment to the rule of law, and we as a Nation cannot sanction extrajudicial killings. America's national security is harmed, not helped, when dictators and strongmen believe they can get away with such heinous actions as the killing of journalist Jamal Khashoggi.

Congress must act to demand accountability for those responsible for Jamal Khashoggi's murder and to send the right signal to the world that America will continue to be a beacon of justice and defender of human rights.

Another cover features Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo, two Reuters journalists who were arrested 1 year ago in Myanmar while working on stories about the killings of the Rohingya Muslims. These journalists remain behind bars, but their wives were photographed for the cover. From this floor, I stood in solidarity with these Reuters reporters who were detained in Burma for shining a light on the horrific abuses that occur in the Rakhine State.

I have stood in solidarity with Ethiopian journalists and bloggers who are routinely arrested for criticizing the Ethiopian Government and exposing human rights abuses in that country. I have talked frequently about China, a country that engages in routine censorship and online blocking, harassment, reprisals, and detention of journalists, visa delays, and denials for journalists.

Another *TIME* cover shows Maria Ressa, the chief executive of the Philippine news website, *Rappler*, who was indicted on tax evasion charges by President Duterte's administration as part of a crackdown on free speech and dissent.

According to the Committee to Protect Journalists, an independent, non-profit organization that promotes press freedom worldwide, more than 600 journalists and media workers have been killed in the last 10 years while doing their job.

Of the member States of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Russia remains the deadliest country for journalists.

Turkey is the largest jailer of journalists in the world, and scores of media outlets have been closed since the attempted coup there. The heavy-

handed measures used against media freedom in Turkey, both before and during the recent elections, illustrates the lengths to which the government went to control the information available to voters. It also serves as a reminder of the essential role of a pluralistic media for free and fair elections.

I have also worked on many other countries that have infringed upon the freedom of press in my role on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a ranking Democrat on the Helsinki Commission. I could give you examples of what we have done in Malta, what we have done in Slovakia, what we have done in Belarus—and the list goes on and on.

I therefore ask the Trump administration and my colleagues in the Senate to redouble their efforts to protect the freedom of the press, both at home and abroad. We must lead by example as the very foundational legitimacy of a democratic republic is at stake.

America's leadership is essential to protect the freedom of the press—an essential institution for a democratic state. We must lead by first setting an example by our commitment to the freedom of press here at home. We must demand that freedom of the press be a priority in our global affairs, recognizing it is important to our national security.

*TIME* magazine got it right by naming the "Guardians and the War on Truth" as persons of the year.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). The Senator from Utah.

#### YEMEN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the Senate is currently considering S.J. Res. 54. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation—lead cosponsor, along with my distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator SANDERS. He and I, along with Senator MURPHY and a number of other Members of this body, have engaged in this bipartisan effort, in a concerted endeavor to make sure that the separation of powers among our three branches of government is respected.

There is perhaps no more morally significant decision made in government than the decision to go to war. Whenever we take an action as a government that puts American treasure and, especially, American blood on the line, we have a sacred responsibility to evaluate and carefully weigh the relative risks and advantages of acting and the relative risks and advantages of not acting.

To make sure that kind of analysis takes place, the Founding Fathers wisely put this power squarely within the branch of government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals—the Congress. This was a big distinction from our former National Government, based in London, where the chief executive—the King—had the power to commit troops to war without going to Parliament.

Alexander Hamilton explained this principle in *Federalist* No. 69. He ex-

plained that it was no accident that this power was put in the hands of Congress. To be sure, the power Congress has to declare war means more than simply to state something in the abstract. It is something that has to happen before we put American blood and treasure on the line.

It is something that should never happen in the absence of some type of dire emergency—some set of exigent circumstances in which the President must protect the United States of America from an imminent attack. It needs to be declared by Congress.

This isn't a mere formality; this is the only thing that guarantees that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is the only thing guaranteeing that we will actually have a debate about the relative merits of the conflict in question. There are a number of reasons why.

In addition to the fact that there is an obvious economic expense associated with war, there is a tremendous human cost associated with war on our side, on the side of those among whom we might be fighting, and on the side of those against whom we might be fighting.

This particular conflict in Yemen provides one of many examples of the moral perilousness associated with war, of the many moral questions brought about as a result of war. We are involved in a conflict half a world away. We are involved in providing targeting assistance, midair refueling, reconnaissance, and surveillance. We are involved in this conflict as cobelligerents.

As we are involved in that, we are responsible in one way or another not only for the American lives that might one day be directly implicated in this conflict—more than they are today because we know how wars go; we know how they tend to spread. We know that once we put the good name of the United States of America on the line, we are understandably reluctant to walk away from it because of what that might say to the rest of the world.

But in order to make it legitimate, in order to make that decision authentic, in order to make it sustainable, it has to be done in the appropriate way, which means it first has to go to Congress.

Many of my colleagues will argue—in fact some of them have argued just within the last few minutes—that we are somehow not involved in a war in Yemen. My distinguished friend and colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma, came to the floor a little while ago, and he said that we are not engaged in direct military action in Yemen.

Let's peel that back for a minute. Let's figure out what that means. I am not sure what the distinction between direct and indirect is here. Maybe in a very technical sense—or under a definition of warfare or military action that has long since been rendered outdated—we are not involved in that, but

we are involved in a war. We are belligerents. The minute we start identifying targets or, as Secretary James Mattis put it about a year ago, in December 2017, the minute we are involved in the decisions involving making sure that they know the right stuff to hit, that is involvement in a war, and that is pretty direct. The minute we send up U.S. military aircraft to provide midair refueling assistance for Saudi jets en route to bombing missions, to combat missions on the ground in Yemen, that is our direct involvement in war.

Now, if you don't agree with me, ask any one of our armed services personnel who is involved in this effort. I would imagine that he or she would beg to differ. I would imagine that the parents, the children, the family members, the loved ones of these brave men and women who have been involved in this effort would beg to differ when told that we are not involved in a war in Yemen.

In any event, regardless of how you define war, regardless of what significance you might attach to direct versus indirect military involvement in a civil war half a world away, it still triggers the constitutional requirement that Congress and not merely the President decide that we are going to get involved in this war.

Look, I understand that there are some competing powers in the Constitution. It was set up deliberately that way. There is some arguable gray area between, on the one hand, the outer limits of the President's Executive authority as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and, on the other hand, the power enjoyed exclusively by Congress to declare war. Because there is some gray area, some matters on which people of reasonable minds might disagree as to where a war begins, Congress, several decades ago, adopted the War Powers Act in an effort to try to delineate the respective powers of these branches. Congress decided, among other things, that it would be significant any time we got involved in hostilities.

Many of my colleagues will argue and many of them have argued on this very day, in fact, that we are not involved in hostilities in Yemen and therefore the War Powers Act is not triggered. Yes, there are a couple of problems with that argument.

One, it is just categorically untrue for the reasons I mentioned a minute ago. We are helping them get to the bombing sites. We are telling them what to bomb, what to hit, what to take out. That is rather direct involvement in war.

Increasingly these days, our wars are high-tech. Very often, our wars involve cyber activities. They involve reconnaissance, surveillance, target selection, midair refueling. It is hard—in many cases, impossible—to fight a war without those things. That is what war is.

Many of my colleagues, in arguing that we are not involved in hostilities,

rely on a memorandum that is internal within the executive branch of the U.S. Government that was issued in 1976 that provides a very narrow, unreasonably slim definition of the word “hostilities.” It defines “hostilities” in a way that might have been relevant, that might have been accurate, perhaps, in the mid-19th century, but we no longer live in a world in which you have a war as understood by two competing countries that are lined up on opposite sides of a battlefield and engaged in direct exchanges of fire, one against another, at relatively short range. War encompasses a lot more than that. War certainly encompasses midair refueling, target selection, surveillance, and reconnaissance of the sort we are undertaking in Yemen.

Moreover, separate and apart from this very narrow, unreasonably slim definition of “hostilities” as determined by this internal executive branch document from 1976 that contains the outdated definition, we ourselves, under the War Powers Act, don't have to technically be involved in hostilities. It is triggered so long as we ourselves are sufficiently involved with the armed forces of another nation when those armed forces of another nation are themselves involved in hostilities. I am speaking, of course, in reference to the War Powers Act's provisions codified at 50 USC 1547(c).

For our purposes here, it is important to keep in mind what that provision reads: “For purposes of this chapter [under the War Powers Act], the term ‘introduction of United States Armed Forces’ includes the assignment of members of such Armed Forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities.”

In what sense, on what level, on what planet are we not involved in the commanding, in the coordination, in the participation, in the movement of or in the accompaniment of the armed forces of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia-led coalition in the civil war in Yemen? I challenge anyone to explain that to me—how it is that we are not involved in the way described by 50 USC 1547(c). We are. Because we are under this power-sharing agreement that was reached in the War Powers Act that has been in place over the last four or five decades, we need to follow those procedures. It is one of the reminders we have that we need to respect the separation of powers.

We first brought up this resolution—or one like it—earlier this year. It was about 8 or 9 months ago. At the time we brought it up and got it to the Senate floor, we utilized a privilege status accorded to resolutions like these in order to secure a vote on the Senate floor to try to bring this bill out of

committee. At the time, sadly, we received only 44 votes to get it out of committee. That was not enough.

Fast-forward a few months to the week before last when we voted on it again. It was, actually, the same vote, and it resulted in 63 Members of this body supporting the idea of advancing it out of committee.

Then, today, we moved to the consideration of this bill, and we got, if I am not mistaken, about 60 votes for that. I am thrilled, I am ecstatic that we had that result, and I look forward to my colleagues passing S.J. Res. 54 in the coming days. I urge my colleagues to vote for it. I suggest, however, that it would have been even better had we done it sooner.

What, you might ask, changed? What changed between when we voted for this a few months ago and we fell short of the votes we needed and when we brought it up the week before last to discharge it out of committee and then voted today to move to the bill? Well, a number of things have happened.

First, the war in Yemen has continued. We have had a whole lot of people killed in Yemen as a result of this civil war. We have had a whole lot more people in Yemen die as a result of causes related to that war. There has been starvation. There have been all kinds of atrocities that have accompanied that war.

Now, I know—this is war, and war inevitably involves atrocities. War inevitably leads to some people dying as a result of a direct kinetic attack, and it almost inevitably leads to other people dying as a result of starvation or their being subjected to other violent acts or tragic outcomes. I get it. That is what war does. That is precisely why it is unconstitutional and morally bankrupt for us to get involved in a war without the people's elected representatives in Congress voting to do so, without our having the ability to debate it, to discuss it, and to vote affirmatively to put our brave young men and women in harm's way to engage in that war.

What else changed in addition to the fact that this war has gone on and on with a lot of death and suffering and misery by a whole lot of innocent people?

We have also seen that when we pulled back the mask a little bit, when we pulled back the curtains and looked into exactly who we were fighting for and why we were fighting, the people, understandably, got a little freaked out. The death, the murder of a journalist got a lot of people's attention.

I completely agree with the comments that have been made by several of my colleagues that every life is sacred, that every human soul has inestimable worth in the eyes of God and should be respected by each and every one of us. It is therefore sad that it has had to take this long for us to care about it. It shouldn't be the case that we had to wait for a journalist to be murdered for us to care about this unconstitutional, unjustified, and, I believe, immoral war.



Regardless of how we got here, we are here. The murder of Mr. Khashoggi caused us to think long and hard—with good reason—about the fact that we have gone somewhat blindly into war, first under a Democratic President and then under a Republican President, where it has been continued, following, somewhat blindly, the leadership of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The fact that the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia has been implicated in the murder of Mr. Khashoggi has caused a lot of people to stop and say: Wait a minute. Maybe this doesn't make sense. Wait a minute. Perhaps this is a regime that we ought not be supporting or at least, at a minimum, regardless of the fact that we may have some interest, some reason to be allied with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in some ways, maybe—just maybe—this is enough of a reason for us not to be fighting a war on behalf of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. We know this to be true.

Those of us who serve in this body or who serve down the hall in the U.S. House of Representatives know something very significant, which is that if we went to almost any one of our constituents in any part of the country and asked them “Why should we, the United States of America—the greatest military power, the greatest republic, arguably, the greatest civilization the world has ever known—be putting American blood and treasure on the line to fight as cobelligerents in a civil war half a world away in Yemen?” we know that 99 times out of 100—perhaps 999 times out of 1,000—that it would not result in a confident answer. We know that it would result in an answer full of uncertainty, ambiguity, grave concern, and well-justified fear for the fact that we are involved in somebody else's civil war—in a civil war in which we have no business fighting, in a civil war in which we have blindly followed the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia into conflict.

This is our decision to make. That war results in bloodshed and the shedding of blood that will be on our hands if we fail to exercise our constitutional prerogatives under a system of government in which we have taken an oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I hope and expect that we will do our duty. I hope and expect that we will respect the lives of those who put their lives on the line to protect us.

I urge my colleagues, with all the emotion and all the compassion I am capable of summoning, to vote for and pass S.J. Res. 54.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to condemn the Saudi military campaign in Yemen, which is causing the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II.

Tens of thousands of young children have already died of starvation, and millions more in Yemen remain threat-

ened by famine and disease. Yemen is experiencing the worst cholera outbreak in history with there being over 1 million cases. In recent months, the crisis has accelerated and grown at a rate of 10,000 cases each and every week.

The air campaign in Yemen, led by Saudi Arabia, is now in its third year, and every day, it makes the humanitarian crisis in Yemen worse. Bombs dropped by Saudi Arabia are killing women and children, destroying roads and bridges, disabling electricity and water services, and leveling schools, hospitals, and mosques.

Meanwhile, the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman stand credibly accused of ordering the murder of a U.S. resident journalist known for his critique of the regime.

Currently, we are debating a resolution that directs the President to remove the U.S. military from hostilities in Yemen and end our Nation's unauthorized participation in this conflict.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 54. I voted to bring it to the floor because the United States should not be providing aerial refueling to Saudi jets bombing Yemen indiscriminately.

The U.S. Senate should pass this resolution and send a clear message that our military will not prolong and will not worsen a humanitarian tragedy led by an increasingly brutal regime.

This is also why I voted against arms sales of additional air-to-ground munitions to Saudi Arabia. More arms sales and more military support for Saudi Arabia are not how we are going to end this crisis. We need meaningful, diplomatic, and political solutions to alleviate human suffering in Yemen.

This is an issue that is deeply personal to me and many Michiganders. I am proud to represent a vibrant and dynamic Yemeni community in Michigan, and I share their heartbreak over the tragic situation impacting innocent Yemenis.

Our Nation must show real leadership and take action to ensure that food, water, medicine, and all necessary humanitarian supplies are made available to those who so desperately need them.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting S.J. Res. 54.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

TRIBUTE TO AARON MURPHY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I am going to change pace a little bit here. I want to talk about a couple of people on my staff who are going to move on to greener pastures, you might say, and I want to acknowledge them.

First of all, I want to acknowledge a man who has always been there for me when I have needed him. Day or night, hell or high water, yes, even during the first few weeks of his fatherhood, my chief of staff, Aaron Murphy, has given himself to Montana and to this Nation.

For years, he and his wife Patience and their children Mira and Wes have

dedicated nights and weekends to ensuring that our State remains the best place to live and raise a family.

Dating back to my first U.S. Senate campaign in 2006, Aaron has been an integral part in shaping my message, crafting my political policy, and ensuring that every word matters. He takes the job seriously, but he never loses the ability to laugh at himself—the mark of a true leader.

One 4th of July, he tasked his communications team to write a statement honoring Independence Day. My team wrote:

We can't be consumed by our petty differences anymore. We will be united in our common interests.

Aaron was appalled by the hyperbole, and he began editing the statement, only to find out that his team had pranked him by copying and pasting lines from the Hollywood blockbuster movie “Independence Day.”

Aaron's no-nonsense style has kept us focused on what really matters, and that is the people. His ability to see the big picture and the end goal is one of his greatest gifts.

His work ethic is second to none. He is the first person in the office in the morning, and he is the last one out at night. He is rooted in his desire to create opportunity for the next generation, and his passion drives him to excel every day—never settling for second best.

He has worked as my press secretary, as my communications director, and now he wraps up his time as my chief of staff.

I want to tell him, on behalf of my entire family and team Tester: Thank you for your service.

Aaron has been at my side through three grueling elections and countless national media appearances.

I remember the first time I met this man. He was working at a local TV station. I was informed by my then-communications director that we had this guy who wanted to work for my campaign. At the time, I said to Matt McKenna: Why would he want to work for me? He has a good job.

Matt responded: Maybe he actually thinks you can win this election.

That is exactly what Aaron Murphy believes. He believes in the future of this country. He believes in the future of Montana.

There was another time, before the 2012 election, when Aaron was driving to my farm. He took the wrong road, and he ended up stuck in the mud. He buried the car up to the frame, and, fortunately, he found a spot where his cell phone worked and got ahold of me. I went out with the tractor and pulled him out of the mud. I was laughing at the time, making fun of his inability to navigate a muddy road, but Aaron saw an opportunity. He later told that story to a national reporter, who used it in a story to show that I hadn't lost my roots.

Thanks for getting stuck in the mud, Aaron.

Here is the thing about Aaron Murphy. He sees things differently. He has the ability to connect with people and drive an agenda that matters to everyday Americans. He is genuinely creative, full of passion, and good for a terrible pun or a dad joke.

Aaron, on behalf of my family, on behalf of the entire staff—both here in DC and in State—I want to thank you for your hard work, your service, your dedication, and your willingness to come back to the political fray and help me for the last 2 years.

Thank you very much.

TRIBUTE TO DAYNA SWANSON

Mr. President, I also want to talk about my State director, who is also leaving for greener pastures. I guess that is what happens when you get re-elected.

My State director's name is Dayna Swanson. She is an incredible woman. She is a leader, wise counsel, and friend. Anybody who knows Dayna knows she is a package of dynamite.

A few years back, Dayna wanted to get an old pickup. She looked around, and she found an old pickup. She found a 1949 Chevrolet pickup that had a pretty, fresh, green paint job. In fact, it was a paint job that also included part of the chrome bumper painted green. It looked good to Dayna, and she bought it. Needless to say, it probably needed a little work. When you went around the corner, the doors would fly open, and sometimes it would start, and sometimes it wouldn't.

I figured, what the heck. It is an old pickup. It is a great parade vehicle. We had a homecoming parade coming up in Missoula, so I asked Dayna if we could use her new 1949 pickup in the parade. We were in the parade with the vehicle and, as usual—it is what you would think—it overheated, the hose blew, and before we knew it, the Lieutenant Governor was pushing the rig down the road with me driving it, which was kind of nice.

That is Dayna. She is not afraid to take a risk. She inherited these traits from two marvelous people, her parents, Butch and Kathy.

Dayna and I come from different parts of the State of Montana, but we still have some things in common. I come from North Central Montana, where agriculture is the business. It is done there, and we dig in the Earth to make a living. She comes from just east of the Continental Divide, where hard-working miners dig in the Earth to find minerals and, consequently, are able to put food on their table.

Her Anaconda roots—her Irish roots—define her, as evidenced by her love of Jameson Whiskey, but it is her heart that makes her so special.

Dayna has compassionately lead my Montana team in the State, guiding them through difficult times, overcoming government bureaucracy, and putting some big wins on the board for the State she loves—Montana.

When a Montanan walks into one of my offices, regardless of what the prob-

lem is, Dayna goes to work to make sure the problem is solved. Dayna's team bends over backward to get them the help they deserve.

Her leadership skills literally save lives. When I first got elected 12 years ago, Dayna designed our constituent casework process. She knew that my No. 1 goal would be to help the people of Montana, and every day since then, she has committed her heart and soul to that mission.

She has ushered Cabinet Secretaries across the State, showing them what rural America looks like. She has worked with county commissioners, State legislators, and everyday Montanans to ensure that Montana remains the last best place.

She has flown in the dead of winter with me when it has been so cold you couldn't see the ground, and when you did land, you could see that the wings of the plane were covered with ice.

For 12 years, she has been my eyes and ears on the ground in Montana. We have spent hundreds of hours together—windshield time—from places like Wibaux to Libby and all along the way. We have shared countless laughs and have worked to make the State a better place.

While her time in my office comes to a close, I know there are great opportunities on the horizon for Dayna and her partner Denise, who just took over as superintendent of schools in the Seattle school system. She will be heading out to Seattle, where she will make Seattle a better place, just as she has made Montana a better place.

In Dayna Swanson's particular case, on behalf of my wife, the entire Tester team, and the people of Montana, I say: Thank you for a job well done.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ZIMBABWE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, last week I chaired a hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health that focused on Zimbabwe.

As a young man, I fell in love with the continent of Africa and, specifically, with the country of Zimbabwe, where I served part of my Mormon mission. The year was 1983, and the country had recently gained its independence. A man by the name of Robert Mugabe was serving as Prime Minister at the time. I don't think anyone could have predicted back then that Mugabe would serve as leader of Zimbabwe until November of 2017, nor could anyone have imagined the damage that he would do to this beautiful country.

Jubilation erupted in the streets of Harare in November of 2017 when

Zimbabweans heard the news that Mugabe had been ousted by his own party and forced to retire. The people of Zimbabwe burst into spontaneous celebration, hoping that with Mugabe finally removed from power, the country might begin to move forward after nearly 40 years of his reign.

I had the opportunity to visit Zimbabwe in February of 2016, where I led a delegation to southern Africa. Mugabe's misrule of the country was certainly evident at that time. The devastation had taken its toll on the capital city of Harare. Yet, somehow, the people of Zimbabwe were so capable, so resilient, and had persevered and were looking to a brighter future.

I was able at that time to reconnect with friends whom I hadn't seen for 30 years, including one of my missionary companions, Peter Chaya, who despite severe physical disability brought on by polio as a child, managed to raise four children and contribute a great deal to his church, to his community, and to his country.

Zimbabwe's greatest potential has always been its people, and it is time for the government to take steps to ensure that this potential can finally be realized.

I want to work with Zimbabwe to make this happen, and that is why I introduced the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Amendment Act, along with Senator COONS, last March. Senator COONS has been a valued partner in efforts to bring better governance to Zimbabwe, and I am sure that we can play a constructive role.

The ZDERA Amendment Act, signed into law in August, reiterates that in order for sanctions on Zimbabwe to be lifted, the government must restore the rule of law, it must hold free and fair elections, and it must demonstrate a sincere commitment to land reform, but—and this is different from the prior statute—our changes send a signal to the Government of Zimbabwe, to the opposition, and to the Zimbabwean people that the United States is interested in improving the state of our bilateral relationship, including in the areas of trade and investment.

The bill asks that the government of Zimbabwe take concrete, tangible steps toward good governance and the enactment of economic reforms. It asks that all statutes inconsistent with Zimbabwe's 2013 Constitution are either replaced or amended to bring them in line with that Constitution. Finally, it underlines the need for a robust civil society that is allowed to function freely and without government interference.

The conditions outlined in the ZDERA Amendment Act are reasonable and will not take too long to achieve. I urge President Mnangagwa to move ahead and repeal troublesome statutes and engage in meaningful economic reform along the lines of what Finance Minister Ncube has already recommended.

I remain concerned that a lack of momentum for reforming Zimbabwe

will squander the opportunity presented by the former President's ouster. We can't expect Zimbabwe to flip a switch and reverse nearly four decades of misrule in a few months' time, but we should expect more urgency to reform the economy and to expand the political space for the opposition.

There is no more outward sign that Zimbabwe has yet to turn the page than the government leveling charges against opposition figures like Tendai Biti and others. There is no purpose served by going after one's political opponents, especially in the wake of a contested election.

The new government of Zimbabwe bears much of the responsibility for forging a positive path forward, but the opposition party needs to play a constructive role there as well. The leader of the Movement for Democratic Change, Nelson Chamisa, is young and capable. He has a long career ahead of him. It would be to his benefit and to the benefit of all Zimbabweans to recognize the legitimacy of the new government and to help create an inclusive process moving ahead.

As in any democracy, Zimbabwe needs a loyal opposition in the form of an opposition party or parties to hold the government accountable within the framework of the rule of law. There will be new elections to contest and more chances to make the case to voters. Now is the time to unify the country.

During this past few months, I have thought often about my friends, like Peter Chaya and others in Zimbabwe, whom I know deserve far better from their government than they have received in the past four decades. They deserve a government that represents them, a government that provides an environment that allows them to follow their dreams and to realize the dreams of their children.

Zimbabwe deserves a government worthy of its people, and I encourage my colleagues to look for ways to engage constructively with Zimbabwe's new government moving ahead. The new ZDERA presents a good, worthy framework.

By next month, my role will change, but I will remain involved, and I will still be committed to a strong partnership between the United States and Zimbabwe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Alaska.

S.J. RES. 54

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, we have been debating for quite some time on the Senate floor the Yemen war powers resolution introduced by my colleagues Senator SANDERS and Senator LEE, which would cut off support for the Saudi-led war in Yemen—support that began under President Obama.

Surrounding this vote today, many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have expressed extreme frustration with the Saudi Crown Prince, Muham-

mad bin Salman, especially regarding the death of Jamal Khashoggi, an American-based Saudi journalist murdered in Turkey. I have a lot of respect for the Senators weighing in, making their arguments all day today, including Senators YOUNG, LEE, CORKER, PAUL, GRAHAM, MURPHY, MENENDEZ, and CARDIN—many. We do need to understand what happened, what our intelligence and our government have surrounding this death. I am glad the CIA Director came to the Hill to brief Members. But this debate has taken something of a much more complex turn.

Certainly, the heinous murderers need to be held accountable. There is no doubt about that. But what we have been discussing, and what is really being implicated here on the floor—which hasn't really been talked about too much—is the broader issue of U.S. or American presence in the region, not just regarding the current conflict in Yemen but also our broader strategic relationship with Saudi Arabia and our national security interests in the region.

My colleagues are justified in their frustration—no doubt I share it as well—with the Saudis, with what is happening, but removing American leadership and oversight from this conflict through this resolution is not the way we should go about addressing this issue. We are trying to execute a policy that both reflects America's values and our national security interests. That is what is being debated here today. We need to send a strong message to the Saudis, but that message cannot undercut our own national security or those of our allies. The message cannot strengthen what clearly is the biggest threat in the region; that is, Iran, the largest state sponsor of terrorism, which almost nobody on the Senate floor has been talking about over the last several weeks. I intend to.

Today's vote has meant different things to different Senators. I have watched and listened to floor speeches. I have participated in debates with my colleagues within the Republican Conference and when all the Senators have met when we were briefed by administration officials.

I thought I would try to unpack a little bit of some of these different arguments as I have seen them and provide my views.

Generally, this debate is focused in three different areas: One, about the constitutional authority—the War Powers Act—that we have actually been undertaking these kind of operations with the Saudis in Yemen. The other is limiting and ending U.S. assistance to Saudi operations—U.S. military assistance—in Yemen. Finally, some Senators have been focused on downgrading the U.S. relationship with the Saudis because of what has been happening both in Yemen and with the Khashoggi murder.

First, let me talk about the constitutional arguments on the War Powers

Act; that the Trump administration needs congressional authority, either pursuant to the War Powers Act or, more important, pursuant to article II of the U.S. Constitution, to conduct military operations in support of Saudi Arabia's military goals in Yemen.

Senator LEE has done a great job of pressing this issue. There are many issues on which I agree with Senator LEE of Utah. He is clearly one of this body's most knowledgeable and passionate Members in safeguarding constitutional prerogatives, but in this case, I simply disagree with him and the other Senators whose views I view as way too restrictive on the Commander in Chief's ability to utilize our military.

If we set the precedent that even an operation such as the refueling of aircraft of allied countries, not even occurring in a war zone, needs congressional authority either through the War Powers Act or article II, we would severely limit the executive branch's ability to direct international crises and safeguard our global national security interests. I believe the notion that refueling allied aircraft constitutes hostilities would be an unworkable precedent and is a stretch of the term.

I have also been skeptical of Senate attempts to vote to remove Presidential authority on our military operations once those operations have begun. For example, we had a debate on military operations and the authority of our military to operate in Afghanistan, which I believe sends the wrong message to our troops. It is a precedent that once hostilities begin, we don't have the backs of our forces. I think that is also a dangerous precedent.

That is not to say this is not an important debate. It is certainly an important debate. Other Members such as Senator Kaine have talked about the importance of the issue of military authority, but with regard to this discussion, I think it is too limiting.

Let me talk about the second major issue involved that most Senators have been focused on: whether to vote to affirmatively end U.S. military assistance to Saudi Arabia and their actions in Yemen and whether and how, in doing so, it will help end the humanitarian disaster going on there.

I compliment Senator YOUNG and Senator MURPHY, who have been making the case passionately on this topic with much expertise. Clearly, they and this body have been focused on two goals: We all want a peaceful resolution to the conflict in Yemen, and we all want an end to the humanitarian disaster in Yemen.

The reason I voted against the resolution today is because I do not believe that either of these goals will be made easier or advanced by less American involvement in the conflict. To the contrary, if the United States no longer has the ability to help guide the Saudis militarily in Yemen, I believe these

two important goals—ending the humanitarian crisis and bringing a peaceful resolution—will actually be harder to reach.

That is not just my view; that was the view of Secretary Mattis and Secretary Pompeo when they came to brief all 100 Senators 2 weeks ago. In particular, Secretary Mattis knows the region and certainly knows about how hostilities end and begin in the region.

The basis of their arguments—with which I agree—was, first, there is no doubt the Saudis have prosecuted the war badly, but both the Obama administration's Department of Defense and the Trump administration's Department of Defense have worked hard to minimize casualties.

Does anyone actually believe the situation in Yemen will improve without U.S. assistance and guidance? The question almost answers itself. Having our military involved has helped the Saudis improve their coordination and improve their targeting to minimize civilian casualties. Having our military involved has helped the Saudis manage disagreements between them and their Gulf coalition partners. These partners also play an important role in helping to bring an end to this war.

Having our military involved has also helped provide critical leverage as we move into the hopeful peace negotiations underway in Sweden as we speak. Yemen's Government and the Houthi rebels have evidently agreed to a prisoner swap, which could include thousands of prisoners and could be the beginning of a diplomatic breakthrough.

I had the opportunity to talk with Secretaries Mattis and Pompeo this weekend. Both said this would be exactly the wrong time, at a key diplomatic moment, to have the United States limit and end its military assistance to Saudi Arabia.

I know sometimes people don't like to think this way, but military strength and leverage is often critical—critical to successful diplomatic negotiations. For the first time, there is promise—promise in negotiations in Sweden. All of us want that to succeed. However, I believe we undermine our chances of success in these diplomatic efforts if Congress forces the United States to end military assistance to the Saudis.

We also have an even more direct and real national security interest in the region. Yemen is an important front in the war on terror: It is the home to al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, AQAP. They have attempted multiple times to directly attack our homeland. They were responsible for the attack on the USS *Cole* that killed 17 sailors and severely wounded 39 others, and they were responsible for the 2015 massacre at Charlie Hebdo's offices in Paris. Limiting our military involvement in Yemen could pose significant risk with regard to AQAP that I believe would be unacceptable for the American people.

The third line of argument we have seen on the floor and many have been

discussing goes much broader than just the relationship between our military involvement in Yemen and really implicates the entire U.S.-Saudi strategic relationship. It is the desire of a number of my colleagues to use this debate and the despicable Khashoggi murder as an opportunity to fully downgrade this decades-old strategic relationship.

The Saudis are difficult partners, no doubt. They have been for decades. Last week, when I was presiding, Senator RUBIO gave an excellent speech saying that he believed the Saudis are testing the limits of their relationship with the United States and that we should look to draw some hard lines and recalibrate elements of our relationship while demanding improvements in other areas. I agreed with much of Senator RUBIO's speech, including his conclusion, like mine, that we should not be cutting off our military assistance to the Saudis in Yemen because it would do much more harm than good.

Nevertheless, some Senators have argued for much more downgrading of the U.S. relationship with Saudi Arabia. In fact, so much of this has been exclusively focused on the Saudis, with no other reference to any other country in the Middle East, that it seems this debate on the floor has been in a vacuum, but as we know, there are a lot more countries in the region, including the world's biggest sponsor of state terrorism, Iran, which nobody is talking about. We should be talking about them because, in fact, the war in Yemen began when Tehran-backed Houthi rebels seized power in 2015. Again, there is not a lot of discussion about how it began.

Tehran is trying to establish a Hezbollah-like entity on the Arabian Peninsula in Yemen, including increased capabilities to target cities in Saudi Arabia with ballistic missiles supplied by Iran. This is all part of Iran's broader strategy in the region to encircle our traditional allies—whether Saudi Arabia, Gulf Arab States, and of course Israel—with proxy fighters throughout Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, and close relationships in Iraq. Yet no one in this debate seems to want to talk about Iran. I thought I would do so for a minute.

Let's talk about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen. U.S. humanitarian aid has totaled almost \$697 million in the past 14 months. Yes, Saudi Arabia could do a much better job, but they have invested well over \$1 billion to try to end the suffering. Iran—the country which started the war, the country nobody on the Senate floor is talking about—not a dime to relieve the suffering. Sure, they have supplied weapons and ballistic missiles in the tens of millions of dollars but nothing to relieve the suffering.

If we cut off U.S. military assistance to Riyadh and Yemen, you had better believe the one capital in the Middle East that will be cheering the loudest is Tehran—again, the world's largest

state sponsor of terrorism. Such an action would further embolden Iran and no doubt embolden its proxies, while at the same time our allies, including Israel, would feel less secure.

As this debate has carried on in the Senate, with no one talking about the largest state sponsor of terrorism, I have found it very troubling because the lens through which we need to view security in the Middle East is through Iran. Although we have dissatisfaction and frustration with some of our allies, we must remember the most significant and serious threat in the Middle East continues to be Iran.

There has been a lot of focus on the horrible death of Mr. Khashoggi. Any death is horrible, but let me talk about some other deaths.

In the Middle East, in Iraq, we have had over 500 American military members killed and almost 2,000 wounded by improvised explosive devices supplied to Iraqi Shia militias by the Iranians. Let me say that again: Over 2,000 Americans killed and wounded by the largest state sponsor of terrorism. Yet nobody seems to talk about that. Yes, one death of an American journalist is horrible. Over 2,000 American dead and wounded is really horrible. Where was the outrage about those deaths? Where was the outrage about those murders? Where were the editorials about those murders of American citizens? The previous administration wasn't focused on those because they were focused on the Iran nuclear deal.

All I am saying is, in this debate, nobody is talking about the real enemy of the United States—the Iranians, who are watching this debate and smiling because no one is talking about them. So I thought it was important to come down and say: Some of us are. Some of us know you are behind the war in Yemen. Some of us know you continually say you want to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. Some of us know the Iran deal only emboldened you.

What we need to keep in mind is, yes, we have difficult partners. No doubt the Saudis are difficult. They are not perfect by any sense of the word.

But this is a difficult region, and these are difficult issues, and if we think we can debate Yemen and our help there without talking about the Saudis and the Iranians, who started the war and are trying to circle our different allies, including Israel, and think somehow that this debate is not emboldening them more, I think we are misguided.

I voted against this resolution because I still think it is important to keep in mind that the lens through which we need to assess our security interests and those of our allies in the Middle East is through what helps or undermines Iran. I am concerned that this resolution can help them, and that is not good for the United States, it is not good for the war in Yemen, it is not good for the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen, and it is certainly not good for all allies like Israel.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I want to begin by thanking a number of my colleagues who have contributed so much to bringing us to this point on S.J. Res. 54. I have been very pleased and honored to work with them in co-sponsoring these measures in the past—most recently in March and now today—to end all U.S. involvement in the Saudi-led war in Yemen that is killing innocent civilians and murdering children and committing, arguably, war crimes.

The United States should have no complicity in these actions that betray our values and our national interest, so this resolution would direct the removal of all U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities.

There are many to thank—Senators SANDERS and LEE, Senator MENENDEZ, and my colleague from Connecticut, Senator MURPHY—but I want to thank some people who have not been mentioned during this proceeding.

Before Yemen and before the killing of Khashoggi—that is, before the civil war in Yemen and the Saudi involvement in it and before the brutal, heinous killing of the American journalist Jamal Khashoggi—there was 9/11. The victims and loved ones of those victims are remembered by me. They are friends. They are heroes. They have fought relentlessly to hold the Government of Saudi Arabia accountable for its culpability—not yet proven in court, but they are seeking to hold the monarchy accountable for its possible involvement.

They have been largely absent from the discussion on this floor, but they are the original champions of holding the Saudis responsible for any and all possible involvement in supporting the 9/11 attack on our Nation. Make no mistake—their loved ones were victims, but it was an attack on our Nation, on the Twin Towers, on our Defense Department, on a plane that was forced to crash in Pennsylvania.

I am pleased that the U.S. Senate is pursuing justice for Jamal Khashoggi. He was a journalist, an opinion writer for an American newspaper with two young children who are U.S. citizens.

The United States has a moral obligation to end support for a government that engages in this kind of heinous, murderous action. There is intelligence that points directly to the highest levels of the Saudi monarchy—namely to the Crown Prince, Muhammad bin Salman.

The United States ought to end its support for the humanitarian crisis caused by the Saudi-led war in Yemen. Make no mistake—it was and is a Saudi-led attack, and the Kingdom is responsible for it, but this monarchy was doing bad things and engaged in bad behavior well before the Yemen civil war and Khashoggi's tragic death. The Saudis have a long record of violating human rights and international

norms. They have funded extremism that led to the rise of terrorism. They may well have provided financial support and even training for the Saudis who went to the United States and thereafter enabled and led and participated in the attack on this Nation.

We should never forget the survivors and the loved ones of 9/11. We should never overlook the Saudi role in that horrific attack. We should never relent in supporting those 9/11 families.

Fortunately, we have made progress in holding Saudi Arabia accountable for its culpability in 9/11. In 2016, this Congress unanimously passed the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act—JASTA—to allow terrorist victims their day in court, their fair opportunity to hold accountable state sponsors of terrorism, including the Saudi Arabian Government. This September, the Senate unanimously passed my resolution to release all classified documents related to the 9/11 attack. These documents are absolutely essential to giving those families their day in court because they are the evidence that is needed to establish the link the United States has—intelligence dating from those days now seemingly long ago—that inculpates the Saudis.

We must support the continued investigation into 9/11 by our law enforcement and intelligence agencies, and we must support those 9/11 families to ensure that the facts are made public and that the necessary individuals, entities, and governments are held accountable.

The families of victims who perished on that horrific day deserve answers about those events and circumstances surrounding the terrorist attack. We know their pain and grief are very much with them. We should respect their loss and honor it with action.

We should recognize those heroes like Brett Eagleson of Connecticut and the families of Connecticut and New York and New Jersey and all around the country—and so many are from our area of New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey—who continue to demand justice and have done so year after year—well before this resolution came before us.

I say to my colleagues today, we need to keep our resolve alive and well to never forget, never yield to hopelessness, never allow our support for these 9/11 families to diminish, never cease our quest for justice in the name of Brett Eagleson's dad and his family and every family who still suffers the pain and grief from 9/11.

Given the role of the Saudi Government in perpetrating the 9/11 attacks, the brutal murder of Jamal Khashoggi, and the Saudi-inflicted humanitarian crisis, this reevaluation of the U.S. relationship with Saudi Arabia is long overdue.

The Saudi-led war has consisted of an aggressive campaign as brutal as the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, indiscriminately killing civilians and

Houthis alike. Day after day, the humanitarian crisis of famine, cholera, other medical afflictions, and simple trauma to those children trying to grow up in the midst of exploding bombs continues to get worse. The United Nations warns that 14 million Yemenis could face starvation—14 million—14 million innocent people facing starvation.

Diplomatic efforts, in coordination with the United Nations and European allies, are vital to establish a peace framework and ensure civilian access to humanitarian aid.

In the absence of meaningful action from the United States, the humanitarian crisis in Yemen will only worsen. Regional instability will be exacerbated. America's standing in the global community will be further undercut and enduringly diminished.

In March of this year, I led a letter to the Department of Defense with my colleague Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, along with many of our colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee, stating our concern regarding U.S. support for Saudi military operations against the Houthis in Yemen and asking about the DOD's involvement, apparently without appropriate notification of Congress, and its agreements to provide refueling support to the Saudis and the Saudi coalition partners. We were concerned that the DOD had not appropriately documented reimbursements for aerial refueling support provided by the United States.

Eight months later—just days ago—the Department of Defense responded to our letter and admitted that it has failed to appropriately notify Congress of its support agreements; it has failed to adequately charge Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates for fuel and refueling assistance. That admission 8 months after our inquiry is a damning indictment. These errors in accounting mean that the United States was directly funding the Saudi war in Yemen. It has been doing it since March of 2015.

In November, the administration announced an end to U.S. aerial refueling support for Saudi military operations in Yemen, but we still must determine whether the Department of Defense was incompetent or disingenuous—or both—in failing to charge the Saudis and Emiratis for previous refueling assistance. We need accountability, a full explanation from the Department of Defense.

The Department will be seeking reimbursement for its refueling support, but I will continue to demand and conduct oversight to get to the bottom of this apparent negligence. I have made the DOD aware of my concerns, and I will evaluate whether an inspector general investigation is necessary to determine the extent to which U.S. taxpayer funds—potentially millions and tens of millions of dollars—were used to fund the Saudi war and used to fund it without the legally required acknowledgment and approval from the Congress of the United States.

Very simply, the United States should not be funding this war. We should not be supporting this war. We should not be providing intelligence or logistics support. We should not be complicit in the indiscriminate targeting of civilians in Yemen, the murder of children, the famine and humanitarian crisis that are ongoing right now. That is why today we should pass this resolution.

It is all the more important today, as well, that the Senate take a stand, given the Trump family ties to the Saudis and the President's habit of undermining the intelligence community. In the absence of leadership from the President, Congress must reassert its constitutional responsibility to authorize the use of U.S. military support.

We must take action to uphold the Constitution, as well as American values and interests. Intelligence assessments indicate with high certainty that members of the Saudi royal family, including the Crown Prince MBS, ordered and orchestrated the murder of Jamal Khashoggi. But both President Trump and his son-in-law Jared Kushner have undermined these findings and tried to stifle the intelligence community conclusions. They have undermined not only these conclusions but more broadly the intelligence community itself.

President Trump has debased and dishonored brave intelligence professionals by demeaning their fact-based conclusions as "feelings." President Trump has falsely claimed that "we may never know all the facts surrounding the murder of Mr. Jamal Khashoggi."

His Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, unfortunately, have further demeaned those findings by saying that there is no direct evidence or there is no smoking gun. The fact is that there is powerful and compelling evidence.

We know from public statements of my colleagues coming from briefings by the intelligence community, and we recently learned that the White House Middle East adviser—I should put "adviser" in quotes—Jared Kushner offered advice to his close friend Muhammad Bin Salman about how to "weather the storm" during the warranted backlash of Saudi Arabia after the murder of Jamal Khashoggi. Rather than ensuring accountability, Jared Kushner is inexplicably offering support.

There is also stunning evidence that the Saudi Government lobbyists reserved blocks of rooms at the Trump hotel in Washington, paying for an estimated 500 nights in the luxury hotel just 3 months after President Trump was elected, bringing veterans to Washington to lobby against JASTA, the bill I mentioned earlier—the bill that enables the 9/11 victims to have their day in court, the bill that upholds American interests and American values and American people.

The effort of the Saudi Government to bring those veterans to Washington

and fund their stays in the Trump hotel was a despicable irony and insult to America, but it yielded the Trump Organization \$270,000 and millions of dollars, by the President's own acknowledgment—indeed, his boasting—go to the Trump organization from condos, apartments, and offices rented or bought in New York, Chicago, and Washington, DC, to say nothing of deals that may be contemplated by the Trump Organization now or after Donald Trump leaves office. These kinds of payments and benefits directly implicate the emoluments clause of the Constitution. They are part of the reason that I have enlisted almost 200 of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress in a lawsuit called *Blumenthal v. Trump*, and I believe this lawsuit, which claims that the President violated the chief anti-corruption provision of the U.S. Constitution, will shed even more light on those payments and benefits from Saudi Arabia and other countries around the world. These friendships and conflicts of interest demonstrate the very flawed and likely corrupt basis for the Trump administration's foreign policy with Saudi Arabia.

American credibility is at stake. We must end all U.S. involvement in the Saudi war. We must sanction the top levels of the Saudi monarchy under relevant statutes like the Global Magnitsky Act. We must ensure that the President removes U.S. forces from any hostilities against the Yemeni people.

There are countless reasons to vote for this resolution. I call on my colleagues to support it and to make sure that U.S. support for this unacceptable conflict in Saudi—the aggression and attacks by Saudi Arabia on innocent civilians—is ended now.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, under our Constitution, we have article I, which addresses the powers of Congress, and article II, the powers of the Presidency. Our Founders were so concerned that the President would take us into war without justification that they made sure to explicitly place the power to go to war with Congress—with the House and Senate.

But here we are, debating the issue of how the President took us into war in Yemen as a facilitator of Saudi Arabia, providing intelligence, providing advice, refueling planes, providing armaments. It is time for us to take a powerful and clear stand and change this and end this.

Here is what has been going on. For multiple years now, Saudi Arabia has been bombing the civilian infrastructure of Yemen, indiscriminately slaughtering civilians, destroying schools and hospitals and neighborhoods and water systems. What is the result of destroying the water systems? The largest outbreak of cholera in the history of humankind. We now have

well over 100 children under the age of 5 dying of hunger and starvation each day. We are told by the experts that 8 to 14 million people are at risk of starvation, but many are already starving, and not just children under 5—the whole spectrum of society.

We have been directly involved in ways that, in my mind, violate the War Powers Act by directly facilitating the movement of armaments and assisting Saudi Arabia in this assault, and this assault must end. We have to send a strong message, and we can do that through this vote we are facing ahead of us. That is one piece of the conversation regarding Saudi Arabia.

The other piece is that the Saudi Government has assassinated an American resident—an American resident who is also an American newspaper columnist. What do we have as a response? We have the weakest possible response from President Trump, with President Trump saying that we don't know what happened. The Saudi Crown Prince may have been involved; he might not have been involved. Who will ever know?

We need a strong watchdog for American values. We need the President to stand up to Saudi Arabia. We don't need to hear that we are going to be weak in the face of an assassination of an American resident because they happen to buy armaments from the United States. Yet that is what we are hearing from President Trump—weakness, selling out American values because they buy some American products.

What more trouble can we invite around the world if we don't stand up for human rights and we don't stand up for our residents and we don't stand up for our journalists, all tied in together here?

Let's be forceful in how we vote on this resolution. Let's send a strong message.

This challenge of the President in ignoring the article I powers in our Constitution, in which the power to be involved in war is vested in this body, Congress, is not the only problem we have. We also have core corruption of our Constitution in the form of gerrymandering and voter suppression and dark money, all of which erode the fundamental vision, the vision in our Constitution of a "we the people" government, one that serves as President Lincoln so eloquently said, to operate "of the people, by the people, for the people." Instead, we have the government operating of, by, and for the powerful in this country—the 1 percent in this country.

It certainly wasn't done in 2017 with a tax bill that took \$1.5 trillion—or call it \$2 trillion, if you include the interest on the \$1.5 trillion—out of our Federal Treasury and gave it to the very richest Americans. Boy, that is not a "we the people" action.

We didn't invest in healthcare. We didn't invest in education. We need apprenticeship programs. We need technical education. We need better public



schools. We need affordable colleges. We didn't invest in education. We didn't make our healthcare system more affordable. We didn't take on the drug companies. We didn't proceed to invest in the challenge of unaffordable housing. We didn't invest in infrastructure and create living-wage jobs. Those are the four foundations of a thriving family—healthcare, housing, education, and living-wage jobs. We ignored all of that and had the government of the powerful giving \$1.5 trillion or \$2 trillion, if we include the interest, to the richest Americans—government by and for the powerful.

Voter suppression is a key strategy in this. What did President Reagan have to say about that? President Reagan said: "For this Nation to remain true to its principles, we cannot allow any American's vote to be denied, diluted or defiled."

Now, there is a statement by a man who understood that voting is the foundation of our democratic republic—a core right of Americans—and he believed we needed to stand up and make sure that core value remains fully intact. But so often in our Nation we have seen those who wield power for the powerful proceed to deny or dilute or defile the power to vote, particularly in poor communities, particularly in communities of color.

We have seen everything. We have seen poll taxes. We have seen literacy tests. We have seen post-Civil War good character tests. We have seen the use of felony charges to make it impossible for African Americans to vote in the South. We have seen voter intimidation, and we have seen it sometimes through racist dog whistling and political postcards. We have a long history of these types of actions to deny, dilute, and defile the power to vote.

I would like to say there is something of our past that we saw with the 1965 Voting Rights Act, but that act was struck down by the Supreme Court. We are seeing all kinds of forms of voter suppression emerge in 2016 and 2018.

In 2018, thousands of Native Americans in North Dakota living on Tribal reserves and using their P.O. boxes for their mail address were kept from casting a ballot because of a law that came into effect in 2018. It said you can't vote without a conventional address—the North Dakota "conventional address" effort to dilute or deny or obstruct the power to vote.

In Georgia, the then-secretary of State, Brian Kemp, who was himself running for Governor, attempted to block 53,000 Georgians from voting—70 percent of whom were African-American voters—because of minor differences in the wording of the way they filled out their registration form. If the name wasn't exactly identical or had some other slight variation, he was sitting on those voting registration cards—the "identical name" gambit from Georgia.

In Ohio, a county elections board proceeded on the orders of Secretary of

State Jon Husted to purge thousands of Ohioans from the voting rolls. If you are not on the voting rolls, you can't vote when the election comes. Again, who were disproportionately affected? African Americans—the Ohio voting roll purge strategy of voter suppression.

What did we see in North Carolina? Thanks to a law passed by the Republican State legislature, nearly 20 percent of North Carolina's early voting locations were closed, forcing voters to travel longer or wait in long election-day lines to cast their vote. I will give you one guess on who was impacted the most. Who was this target aimed at? Well, it was aimed at African-American voters—the long line strategy from North Carolina and Kansas, as well.

In Kansas, the county clerk in Dodge City, citing construction, moved the only polling place in a town that is 60 percent Hispanic from a spot downtown to an arena built for rodeo and farming shows outside the city limits. This was a location that had no sidewalk and is separated from the rest of the city by train tracks, making it as difficult as possible for voters to get there. It was targeted at a Hispanic community.

We saw voting suppression aimed at college students, too. In Iowa, the legislature passed a bill to cut 11 days off early voting this year in order to make it harder to vote. It also had a tricky little deal on an ID requirement, which will not now go into effect until next year, but it created a great deal of confusion about this year because it made people think they weren't eligible to vote because it said your ID had to have an expiration date on it. Why was this tricky little thing done? Because college IDs often don't have an expiration date on them.

Well, it is a total violation of the vision Ronald Reagan laid out, and really, of the foundation—the vision—of our Constitution and the power to vote.

In New Hampshire, a bill was signed into law this past July aimed at suppressing college-age voters as well. It says students and other part-time residents have to become permanent residents. How do you become a permanent resident in order to cast a ballot? You have to buy an in-State license. If you have a car in another State, you have to reregister it in New Hampshire, which means registration fees, fees for license plates, and possibly separate State and municipal fees. It is like a poll tax placed on college students. So there we have this 21st century poll tax coming back aimed at college students.

Why are all these voting suppression strategies aimed at poor communities, aimed at communities of color, African-American communities and Hispanic communities? Why are they aimed at college students? They are aimed at these three populations because those three populations vote primarily on the Democratic side of the ballot. It is wrong for any official in this country to simply target voters of

the other party to try to prevent them from voting. It is un-American. It goes against the essence of what our Constitution is all about.

It is wrong, and yet, since the Voting Rights Act was torn down by the Supreme Court of the United States, we see it time and again. We don't just see it before the election. We see it during the election day.

In Georgia, we saw hours-long lines to vote in majority-minority districts, either because machines didn't happen to be working or they didn't have the extension cords to turn them on.

In Arizona, one polling place didn't exist on election day because even though people were told to vote there, it was in a building that was locked up. Voting machines were inside, but the doors were locked. The building had been foreclosed on, but they didn't bother to move it next door or somewhere close by, enabling people to vote.

In Texas, we heard about the machines that were changing people's votes from a Democratic candidate to Republican candidate.

All the while, President Trump was working to cast doubt on the legitimacy of our normal election processes—tweeting out that ballots coming in after election night shouldn't be counted. What was he talking about down in Florida, about ballots that shouldn't be counted? We are talking about the absentee ballots for our soldiers overseas. But because the President was concerned that they might change the outcome, he didn't want them counted.

If only Ronald Reagan could spend a few minutes with President Trump and remind him of what our Nation is all about, what our Constitution is all about, how important voting is, and that it should never be denied or diluted.

None of these efforts are unique. We saw these efforts back in 2016, as well, in the first election after the Voting Rights Act was torn down by the Supreme Court. That was the Shelby County v. Holder decision. The Court thought this wasn't necessary any more. Maybe they should ask Congress whether it was necessary. Now that we find out it was necessary, maybe they should reverse their decision. We need to put a new issue before them. Maybe we need a new Voting Rights Act. Maybe it should apply to every State, rather than just the States that were in the 1965 Voting Rights Act bill.

In 2016, that first election after the Voting Rights Act was torn down by the Supreme Court, we saw 900 fewer polling places open to voters than in 2014—2 years earlier. Most of that change was in the States that previously were under the regulation, the oversight of the Voting Rights Act. We saw that in Texas, Arizona, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, and North Carolina. When you reduce the number of polling places in poor communities and communities of color, you create long wait lines, and you deny the vote.

Nearly 17,000 Wisconsinites—disproportionately minorities—were kept from the polls because of Wisconsin's voter ID law. The State saw its lowest turnout in two decades. This law had nothing to do with security. It had everything to do with voter suppression because it is a known fact that residents in low-income and minority communities are less likely to be able to access the IDs that are required for polls. This is keenly targeted.

In fact, after North Carolina's voter ID law was struck down in 2016, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals decision noted that it targeted African Americans with "almost surgical precision." The State resorted that year—after it was struck down—to eliminating early voting days, severely curtailing the number of polling places, and affecting their hours of operation in communities of color.

By the way, the lead plaintiff in the case that challenged the voting suppression strategy of the voter ID law passed away this weekend at age 97. Ms. Rosanell Eaton was once described by President Obama as a beacon of civil rights. She was a life-long devotee of and advocate for voting rights. Now, that is a patriot.

It is because of unsung heroes like her that our Nation has come far and why we must continue pushing ourselves forward to ensure justice and equality for all.

In a "we the people" nation, can any of these efforts to suppress the vote be allowed to continue? The answer is no—not if we want the vision of government of, by, and for the people. How can any of us sit by and allow citizens of this country—citizens like Rosanell Eaton—to be systematically denied the most fundamental right?

We have to work together—Democrats and Republicans—to honor and to strengthen the vision of the ability to vote. We need a fierce and formidable voting rights bill for the 21st century, ensuring in every way possible that every single American can exercise his or her right to vote freely and fairly. We need a voting rights bill that bans the type of shenanigans and the types of deceptive strategies that target poor communities, communities of color, and college students that I talked about today.

But we also need a voting rights bill that requires preapproval for changes to voting procedures to make sure that they are not being changed in order to take away the ability to vote and to make it more difficult for some communities than for other communities within a State. We need a voting rights commission with the power to ban new voter suppression practices as they evolve because, surely, people will try new strategies from people who do not believe in the vision of our Constitution.

From the 15th amendment of 1870, which recognized African-Americans' right to vote, to the 19th amendment of 1920, 50 years later, which recognized a

woman's right to vote, and all the way up to the civil rights marches of the 1960s and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, America's story has been of expanding opportunity for every American to have a say in the direction of our government.

But we are far from ensuring that today every American has that opportunity because the strategies of voter suppression are rampant, they are extensive, and they are targeted. Voter suppression and voter intimidation must end, and we need to ensure that every American has the unfettered right to have a voice in their government, that every American has the unfettered right to cast a ballot during the election.

President Reagan had it right back in 1981. He supported the expansion of the Voting Rights Act. He said: "For this Nation to remain true to its principles, we cannot allow any American's vote to be denied, diluted or defiled."

Let's make it so.

Thank you, Mr. President.

(Mr. GARDNER assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Colorado.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1154 through 1169 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John N. T. Shanahan

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Kevin B. Schneider

#### IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

#### To be major general

Brig. Gen. Stephen J. Hager

Brig. Gen. Mary K. Leahy  
Brig. Gen. Gabriel Troiano  
Brig. Gen. Jonathan Woodson

#### To be brigadier general

Col. Tina B. Boyd  
Col. Brian T. Cashman  
Col. Walter M. Duzzny  
Col. Eric Folkestad  
Col. Ernest Litynski  
Col. Nelson G. Rosen

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

#### To be major general

Brig. Gen. Laura L. Yeager

#### IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

#### To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Michael M. Gilday

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

#### To be major general

Brigadier General Jeffrey W. Burkett  
Brigadier General Jessica Meyeraan  
Brigadier General Russ A. Walz

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

#### To be brigadier general

Colonel James R. Camp  
Colonel Wesley J. Clare  
Colonel James T. Demarest  
Colonel John M. Green  
Colonel Peter T. Green, III  
Colonel Robert C. Korte  
Colonel Darrin P. Leleux  
Colonel Mark A. Maldonado  
Colonel James P. Marren  
Colonel John R. Mulvey  
Colonel John F. O'Connell  
Colonel Matthew J. Peterson  
Colonel Robert A. Schulte  
Colonel James G. Silvasy

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

#### To be brigadier general

Colonel Darrin K. Anderson  
Colonel Mark D. Auer  
Colonel Buel J. Dickson  
Colonel Kenneth S. Eaves  
Colonel Steven S. Lambrecht  
Colonel Toni M. Lord  
Colonel Glen A. Martel  
Colonel David W. May  
Colonel Gary A. McCue  
Colonel Thomas H. Mora  
Colonel John W. Pogorek

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

#### To be brigadier general

Col. Thomas A. Dukes, Jr.

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212: