

needs you now. America needs you to help pressure the Deputy Attorney General to name a special prosecutor to compel this White House to turn over the transcripts and tapes to Congress, to demonstrate that the Congress the American people elected, Democrats and Republicans, can come together to do the right thing when it matters most. I repeat to all of my colleagues: History is watching.

This is not a casual or usual time. As great as the desire would be to repeal ObamaCare or do tax reform, the very faith in the institutions of government now are being tested. They have been tested in the past. This is not the first time in American history they have been tested, but in the past, there have been people who rose above party, rose above an immediate interest to defend the needs of the Republic. Is it going to happen now?

History will judge on whether this Congress and these Senators have been able to do what so many Senators before us, Democrats and Republicans, have done in the past: Put country above party. Whether we have decided to act as an appropriate check and balance as the Founders intended or whether we will let this continue, history will judge us all. Whether we decide to act in the way that is appropriate, history will judge us. Whether, in this moment of trial, the Senate is able to rise above partisanship and achieve statesmanship, again, history will judge us.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, more than 3 million Illinoisans—about 20 percent of the people in my State—currently depend on Medicaid and the

Children's Health Insurance Program for healthcare. That is one out of five people in my State who need these programs to have basic health insurance for themselves and their children.

This includes 300,000 Illinois seniors and people with disabilities, 650,000 who were recently added as part of the Affordable Care Act. It also includes 1.5 million children. Half of all the kids in Illinois are enrolled in Medicaid and the CHIP program, which in Illinois is called ALL Kids.

Nationwide, the Medicaid Program helps pay for two out of three seniors in their nursing homes. It pays for about half of all children born in this country. It is the primary payer of all mental health and opioid addiction treatment. It provides healthcare to 25 percent of people in rural communities. It pays for special education in nearly half of all school districts and provides critical support for veterans with chronic conditions.

What does the House of Representatives Affordable Care Act repeal do to the programs I have just described? It ends the expansion of Medicaid. It would eliminate coverage for 650,000 people in the State of Illinois. Think about that. We had seven of our Republican Congressmen vote for a program that will eliminate health insurance under Medicaid for 650,000 people in my State and cut \$840 billion in Federal Medicaid funding. Well, if they are going to cut this money for Medicaid funding, what are they going to do with it? The House knew exactly what to do with it: They give it back in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America. Is there justice in that decision? Is it too much to ask that those of us who are better off in life pay a little more in taxes so that those who are struggling have basic healthcare? I don't think so, but those who voted for the Republican House plan do. The bill cuts healthcare for struggling families, women, seniors, and children in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest people in America.

Illinois would lose \$40 billion over the next decade, and 3 million people would be at risk of losing their care. Absolutely no one believes Illinois is going to magically come up with \$40 billion to fill this Medicaid shortfall. I doubt many other States will be able to either. With funding cuts this dramatic, even Illinois's Republican Governor spoke out against the House action repealing the Affordable Care Act. He said it is going to force us to make significant changes in healthcare in Illinois. He would have to decide who gets healthcare and who doesn't. He would have to decide whether healthcare services are just too expensive to cover.

Hospitals, too, would be devastated by the proposed Medicaid cuts. I was born and raised in downstate Illinois. It doesn't look at all like the city of Chicago. I am proud to represent that city. I enjoyed being there and being a part of it. I grew up in smalltown

America, and the congressional district I represented basically was smaller cities—no more than 100,000 population at the time—with a lot of smaller towns. I can't tell you the pride those communities take in downstate Illinois in their hospitals. Some of those hospitals are a lifeline—the only source of healthcare for miles around. They are great employers. They bring in medical specialists who are paid good salaries by local standards.

The Illinois Hospital Association is dead-set against what the House Republicans did in passing their repeal of the Affordable Care Act. They have told us that Illinois stands to lose up to 60,000 healthcare jobs because of that vote in the U.S. House of Representatives. Of course, that means that for many of the people who count on these rural hospitals, even inner city hospitals in Chicago, those services are going to be curtailed and denied.

When I sit down with people like Ed Curtis, who is the president of Memorial Medical Center in Springfield and speaks for Illinois hospital administrators across the State—he tells me the devastating impact it will have when Medicaid coverage is eliminated and sick people still show up for care. They will be taken care of; their expenses will be shifted to other people. That is the way it used to be before the Affordable Care Act, before Medicaid expanded and gave these individuals in low-income situations basic health insurance.

Why would Republicans in the House of Representatives want to have such a devastating negative impact on Medicaid? So they can give tax cuts to wealthy people? That, to me, is inexplicable.

The Illinois Hospital Association speaks across our State for those who really care about those great institutions, but they are not alone in opposing this bill. The Illinois Nurses Association opposes it, as do the Illinois pediatricians and the Illinois Medical Society. Why does every medical advocacy group in Illinois oppose this bill, this so-called Republican reform of our healthcare system? Because they know it moves in the wrong direction. It eliminates healthcare coverage instead of expanding it. It makes healthcare too expensive and out of reach for people who are not lucky enough to have it at work and not wealthy enough to buy it on their own. It moves in the wrong direction. It is not a solution to any problem; it is a new and even worse problem than the ones we faced in the past.

Remember when Candidate Donald Trump tweeted in May of 2015: "I was the first and only potential GOP candidate to state there would be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid"? Then he tweeted in July of 2015—"The Republicans who want to cut Social Security and Medicaid are wrong," said Candidate Trump. He was right, but now he supports this bill which dramatically cuts Medicaid coverage across America.

What is going to happen to the elderly in nursing homes who, despite all their Social Security payments and despite all of their Medicaid reimbursement, still don't have enough resources for the basic care they need to stay alive? When they cut back on that Medicaid coverage, what happens to them? What do their families do to make up the difference? Reach into their savings? Bring mom home from the nursing home in the hopes that they can take care of her in their own home? Those are choices no family should face and no family need face.

I hope the Senate will show the courage and leadership on a bipartisan basis to say no to this terrible bill that passed the U.S. House of Representatives just 2 weeks ago. We need to put together a bill that expands the coverage of health insurance, gives people more peace of mind; a bill that addresses some of the built-in challenges we had with the Affordable Care Act, which is far from perfect. There are things we can do to improve it.

We need to do something about the cost of pharmaceutical drugs. The current law doesn't really affect that. They are out of control at this point.

Secondly, I think we ought to offer a public option. There ought to be a Medicare-type program available across the United States for those who wish it. Medicare enjoys a very positive reputation in America for good reason. Most Americans would feel honored and happy to be protected by a Medicare-type program.

We also need to go to those premiums that are too high and ask why. In many cases, there are individuals who are buying health insurance from very narrow pools of people who are older and sicker. We need to expand that pool so it is real insurance, and we can bring those premiums down. There are ways to do that.

There are many things we can do with reforming the Affordable Care Act, but what the House of Representatives did, what some want to do, is just repeal it and walk away. It would be devastating to the women in America who rely on Medicaid to pay for their delivery expenses, as well as prenatal and postnatal care. It would be devastating to seniors who are in nursing homes and are dependent on Medicaid supplements and for those who are disabled with chronic conditions and have to turn to Medicaid just to make sure they can maintain their lifestyle and still be productive, happy, and safe. These are the elements and these are the costs we would have to charge if we are not careful.

Wouldn't it be great, wouldn't it be terrific, wouldn't it be a headliner to say that Democrats and Republicans came together in the U.S. Senate to make the Affordable Care Act better, to make sure there was more accessible, affordable, quality coverage for more Americans? I think that is why we were elected, and I hope we can achieve that goal.

Mr. President, before I yield, I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls until 12 noon today be charged equally to both sides.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

YEMEN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, colleagues, I am very pleased to be joined on the floor today by Senator YOUNG. We are both members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and both have an interest in Middle East security. We have joined together on the floor today to give remarks and perhaps have a short colloquy about a humanitarian crisis that is unfolding before our eyes in the Middle East.

Today, inside the country of Yemen—a country that, frankly, not a lot of our constituents give much thought to—every 10 minutes a child under the age of 5 is dying due to preventable causes. Today, 18 million Yemeni civilians—two thirds of the entire population of this country—cannot survive without humanitarian or protection support, and 7 million of those are on what we would call a starvation diet, which means that on a daily basis they don't know where their next meal is coming from. They don't have enough food to eat in order to remain healthy. Three million have already fled their homes because of the violence that has been caused by a civil war—that both Senator YOUNG and I will talk about—inside their country and the humanitarian catastrophe that has resulted from that civil war.

This is one of four current famines that exists in the world today. But I would argue that this particular humanitarian crisis is in some ways the most relevant to the discussions we will have here in the Senate because the United States is participating in the military campaign that is, in fact, causing in part this humanitarian crisis.

The United States is an active participant with a Saudi-led military campaign seeking to regain control of Yemen from a group called the Houthis, who overran the capital and now control large portions of the country.

We, of course, are allies of Saudi Arabia. The President will be visiting Saudi Arabia very soon to solidify that alliance. But it is time we started asking some really hard questions about the conduct of the Saudi campaign inside Yemen and whether we are, in fact, helping to create a humanitarian catastrophe on the grounds that is im-

possible to defend on moral grounds but also is hard to defend based on national security grounds as well.

Let's be honest about what is happening here. The Saudis are deliberately trying to create a famine inside Yemen in order to essentially starve the Yemenis to the negotiating table. Saudi Deputy Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman said:

Time is on our side. Being patient is in our interest. We have the supplies and we have the logistics and high morale. The enemy does not have supplies and funds and is impatient. Time is on our side and we will exploit the time to serve our interests.

What are the Saudis doing to try to exploit this question of time and supplies? First, they are coming directly after the main port city, which brings 70 percent of food into Yemen and about 80 percent of all of the oil. That port city is called Hodeidah.

Senator YOUNG has been very good in meetings to draw issue with what is believed to be deliberate targeting by the Saudis of the cranes and infrastructure in this port which allow for the supplies to come off of boats and move into these desperately, desperately needy areas of the country.

Second, they are requiring an additional screening process for this humanitarian aid above and beyond the one the United Nations has put into place. The United Nations is vetting supply ships coming in to Hodeidah to make sure there is really food and aid on these ships, not weapons, and it is working. But the Saudis are putting an additional process on top that is adding up to a month from the time the aid gets off the ship and into the country. Between that and the military campaign targeting the port and its infrastructure, this has essentially resulted in an effective blockade being put in and around Hodeidah, such that humanitarian support cannot effectively get into the country. But that is just the beginning.

The Saudi bombing campaign has deliberately targeted roads and bridges throughout the country, many of them in and around north Yemen. There are reports that the bombers have engaged in something called double tapping, which is where you hit a humanitarian—a civilian—asset. You wait until the workers come to try to address that first strike, and then you hit it a second time to take out the civilians who have responded to the emergency. This isn't just my opinion of the situation. Representations have been made by multiple aid organizations on the ground, and, more importantly, by U.S. officials who have been embedded with the coalition.

This is a quote from Dafna Rand, the former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State who was in charge of the Saudi coalition portfolio at State:

In 2015, the U.S. Government offered technical training on cyber, ballistic missiles, border security, counterterrorism, and maritime security, [and] the precision guided munitions were transferred in 2015 on the hopes that they would enable better and more precise targeting by the coalition of the targets