

do all that despite the lack of a military solution to end the war. The longer we enable the conflict to continue, the more innocent men, women, and children will die.

Instead of facilitating endless fighting, we must push for reconciliation. I have personally urged Saudi and Iranian officials to meet to discuss their differences. To my great disappointment, they refuse to do so. I welcomed Secretary Mattis's announcement that the United States will no longer refuel the coalition's aircraft, but more must be done.

Until there is a congressional authorization, all U.S. forces supporting the coalition's war should be withdrawn. That is why I support the Sanders-Lee resolution. Voting to remove our forces will send a clear message that we will no longer be complicit in this conflict. Secretaries Mattis and Pompeo have publicly called for a ceasefire, which has been ignored.

By ending our participation in this brutal war, we will send an unambiguous message that we will not accept continued bloodshed.

I am voting for the Sanders-Lee resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the issue before us.

On every occasion, I too have done what is necessary to keep us from alienating our ally Saudi Arabia. I think I was the last man standing, during the Obama administration, in my trying to make sure that the JASTA bill, at the time, ended up being corrected in such a manner that it wouldn't have had unintended consequences. I did so unsuccessfully. Yet, on multiple occasions, I have stood with others to make sure that we have not blocked arms sales and that we have not done those things that might have undermined our relationship.

For those who are tuning in, let me walk through what the process is.

We have a vote, today, on discharging this piece of legislation out of the Foreign Relations Committee. That is all that is happening today. There is an Executive Calendar in which we have cloture votes pending on nominees. That will burn off. Then, sometime next week, after this is discharged today—if it is so successfully—there will be another vote to actually proceed to this bill. If we proceed to the bill, what will happen will be a series of amendments that will be voted upon. Then there will be another vote at the end of that as to whether people will actually support the product that will have been created.

I just want to make it clear that what I am not doing today is voting for the substance before us; yet I reserve the right to do so. I am voting on our ability to have a debate as it relates to our relationship with Saudi Arabia.

We had a briefing today, which was very unsatisfactory, by two people

whom I highly respect. Secretary Mattis and Secretary Pompeo are two people with whom I work closely and admire greatly. I found their briefing today to be lacking. I found, in substance, that we are not doing those things that we should be doing to appropriately balance our relationship with Saudi Arabia between our American interests and our American values.

There has been a lot of rhetoric that has come from the White House and from the State Department on this issue. The rhetoric that I have heard and the broadcast that we have made around the world as to who we are has been way out of balance as it relates to American interests and American values. As I said this morning in the SCIF, where we were having this briefing, I hope that in the ensuing few days—maybe this afternoon—the administration itself will take steps to rectify this balance in an appropriate way.

As to whether the Crown Prince was involved in this killing, it is my belief that he was. It is my belief that he ordered it, but I don't have a smoking gun. What I do know is that he is responsible for this agency that carried out the killing. He has done nothing to take ownership of what has happened, and that is an affront not just to the American people but to the world.

The administration, in its broadcast, in its referring to this issue, has been way out of balance as it relates to what is important to us—their buying arms from us but neglecting this other piece and not demarching the leadership of Saudi Arabia in an important way. So what I am doing today is voting to discharge this bill out of our committee. There will be another opportunity next week to decide whether we will proceed to it.

As I said to the administration again this morning, it is my hope that it will figure out a way to bring American interests and American values into balance so that it can cause the Saudi Arabian Government to take appropriate ownership over what has happened in the killing of this journalist. That, to me, would be the best solution. If not, we will have another decision to make, and that will occur next week when we will decide whether we want to proceed to that and then, after that, proceed to deal with the issue of Saudi Arabia. There will be another point in time at which we can decide whether we like the substance that may be created in an amendment process in our going through this.

I support discharging this piece of legislation so that this body can have a fulsome debate about our relationship with Saudi Arabia as to what has happened with the journalist, the important issue of the war in Yemen, and as to all of the things that we need to be doing as a country to counter what Iran is doing in the region.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, out of respect for Senator INHOFE and a personal issue he has to deal with, we would hope to be able to vote early.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, 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.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 250 Leg.]

YEAS—63

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

NAYS—37

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Heller	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott
Cotton	Isakson	Shelby
Crapo	Johnson	Sullivan
Cruz	Kennedy	Thune
Enzi	Kyl	Tillis
Ernst	Lankford	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	
Gardner	Perdue	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GARDNER). On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 37.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session in consideration of the Farr nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I was happy to welcome back our colleagues this week from Thanksgiving and come back to work. A lot of stuff needs to be done and have some fresh energy and maybe some fresh ideas, but I hope my colleagues were able to get home for Thanksgiving and spend time with their families. I like to say the thing I like about Thanksgiving—it is my favorite holiday, and people ask why. It

has my six favorite F words: family, faith, friends, food, fun, football, among others. What is not to like about that—especially football that was played in Columbus, OH, on Saturday afternoon. I hope all Americans were able to enjoy some combination of those things over the holiday weekend.

You may be like me and many others across the country who took the long weekend to unplug a bit by turning off our phone, maybe turning off cable news, too, so we could reconnect with loved ones, but while many Americans were recharging—enjoying a good meal with family and friends, maybe watching a football game or doing some early Christmas shopping—some major news broke over the weekend.

Last Friday, on the day after Thanksgiving, 13 Federal agencies released a nearly 1,700-page report highlighting the devastating impacts climate change will have over the next 80 years if we do not change course now. The report was a dire warning to our Nation and to our planet but one we might have easily missed while celebrating the holiday with family and friends, and I am sure a lot of people did miss it.

I suspect the fact that this major report was released on Friday of a holiday weekend was not an accident. After all, the report, which was put together by experts from over a dozen agencies within the Trump administration, spells out the very real and very serious consequences of climate change—a global crisis that our President has repeatedly called a hoax. In fact, just yesterday the President said he is not among the so-called believers who see climate change as a pressing problem.

Luckily, we don't have to just blindly believe in climate change. We can look at the facts. Despite the Trump administration's best efforts to bury this report on a Friday afternoon, Friday evening, of a holiday weekend, those of us based in reality are going to make sure the clear facts in it are broadcast far and wide.

This particular report took not a year, not 2 years but 3 years to write. It was written by more than 300 Federal experts, non-Federal experts as well, who volunteered their time. It was only finalized after an extensive public outreach and interagency review process. This report wasn't thrown together to push any agenda. It is a scientific report, and its conclusions should be important to every person, not just living in my State or the 49 or 50 States but everybody who lives on this planet because it has implications for every single one of us.

I would like to take a few minutes this afternoon to go over some of the highlights of the report. Why don't we start with extreme weather. People ask: What do you mean by extreme weather? I mean, measuring rainfall by feet, not by inches. I am talking about fires in States on the west coast, espe-

cially where the amount of land being consumed by the fires is almost the size of my State of Delaware. I am talking about the number of 500-year floods that are occurring every other year or every year. I am talking about the number of category 5 hurricanes that we have now compared to what it was 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 years ago.

According to the latest report—which was, again, released by the Trump administration—climate change will continue to increase and intensify extreme weather events in the years to come. Over the last 3 years alone, extreme weather events have cost the United States nearly \$400 billion in damages due to storm surges, due to flooding, due to wildfires, and due to crop freezes and crop droughts. So it has cost the U.S. Treasury \$400 billion, and it comes at a time when our budget deficits are going up. The budget deficit picked up between the last administration and this administration, I think, somewhere—maybe \$500 billion—a huge amount of money. Last year's deficit on this administration was, as I recall, maybe \$750 billion. I am told the expectation for the budget deficit in this year is maybe as much as \$950 billion. It wasn't that long ago that the budget for our whole country was less than that.

Why is \$400 billion in damages from extreme weather important? We don't have the money. We are borrowing this money, and these young pages and their children will get to pay for that someday. That is not fair.

More powerful and more frequent extreme weather events will increase that figure exponentially and also have far-reaching impacts on people in every corner of this country and well beyond the borders of our country.

Say someone happens to live in the Southwest. In 2017, Phoenix, AZ, set a new record of nearly 200 days with temperatures of at least 90 degrees Fahrenheit. Think about that, Phoenix, AZ, 200 days with temperatures of at least 90 degrees Fahrenheit in 2017. By 2090, Phoenix could be dealing with an additional 45 days—another month and a half—every year, which would be about 245 days, which would be about 8 months out of the year where the temperature in Phoenix is 80 or well above 90. That is another 6 weeks of extreme heat in addition to the city's already recordbreaking temperatures.

Let's say somebody lives in the Southeast. Let's take Charleston, SC, for example. Charleston, SC, experiences 38 days of tidal flooding every year. By 2045, the city could experience 180 days of tidal flooding every year—nearly five times the flooding that occurs today.

Let's say maybe somebody lives out West. By 2050, wildfire seasons could burn up to six times more forest area every year. I will say that again. That is hard to believe. By 2050, wildfire seasons could burn up to six times more forest area every year. We have all seen the historic and horrific devastation

that fires in California have caused just this year alone—in fact, in the last several weeks alone, tragic fires.

California is a big State. I used to live there when I was in the Navy. Sometimes it is difficult to put into context just how big and destructive these wildfires are. We have a poster here that I want to refer to as a wildfire poster: This is Washington, DC, and the counties adjacent to Washington, DC. It gives a little bit of context. Here is the area that the recent Camp Fire in California burned in relation to a city that all of us who serve here are pretty familiar with, Washington, DC, and the suburbs of this city. The Camp Fire burned an area over three times greater than Washington, DC. That is how big it was. That is just one fire, in just one State, in 1 year. Imagine what we are going to be facing with up to six times more forest areas burning every single year.

Now, if the extreme weather conclusions don't make some of our colleagues jump to action, maybe the information about the health impacts of climate change will cause them to take some notice. This report makes clear that increases in ozone and particle pollution will result in an additional \$26 billion every year in healthcare costs across the country.

Here is a particularly startling statistic: Extreme hot and cold temperatures in 49 U.S. cities are projected to result in more than 9,000 additional premature deaths per year. That is not in a far-off developing nation. That is 9,000 more people dying right here at home in the USA, but if our colleagues are still not swayed by this year's impacts to American health, maybe they will be moved by the impact that climate change will have on our country's already aging infrastructure.

I think this is probably highway transportation infrastructure, if I am not mistaken. If we do not act, we can expect up to \$26 billion in damages to our roadways and our railways every year due to climate change—\$26 billion in damages to our roadways and our railways every year due to climate change.

We have a poster here. There is a bridge. I am not sure where, but it is one of many bridges. We have thousands of bridges around this Nation. Increases in rainfall in inland areas—not on the coast but in the middle of our country, the heartland—will threaten up to 6,000 bridges by the year 2090.

Here is a statistic we will not be able to avoid. It deals with sea level rise. Since 1993, sea levels have risen by 3 inches. What we are looking at by 2100, according to folks who worked for the last 3 years on this Federal report from 13 Federal Agencies, we could be looking at as much as 6 feet in sea level rise. If we do nothing, by 2100, we could see sea levels rise by up to 6 feet. Those of us who lived through Superstorm Sandy saw the absolute destruction that can be caused by 3 inches of sea level rise. It is almost unimaginable to think about nearly 70 inches.

Maybe that is still not alarming enough to get some people's attention. Perhaps the impacts on our farmers and ranchers might sway my colleagues. Let me mention something in that regard. According to this report—the same Federal report—more frequent and intense rains, combined with rising temperatures, are likely to reduce agriculture production in the Midwest to 1980 levels. Roll back the clock to the levels of production in 1980 in the Midwest—that is where we were.

I have a corn and soybean poster here. When it comes to crops that agricultural communities depend on, such as corn and soybeans, which are big in my State, farmers could see reduced yields of up to 25 percent.

Maybe some of our colleagues don't come from States with a large agricultural sector, where it is important. Perhaps an economic impact might move them to action.

Climate change could mean up to \$500 billion in economic losses every year by 2090. Let me say that again. Climate change could mean up to \$500 billion in economic losses every year by 2090. Additionally, almost 2 billion labor hours are projected to be lost by 2090 due to the impacts of extreme temperatures. That alone would cost an additional \$160 billion in lost wages.

Here is a stark statistic: Climate change could slash up to 10 percent of our gross domestic product by 2100. Let's put that into context. Ten years ago, when we fell into the great recession—worst recession since the Great Depression—we had half of the losses in gross domestic product that we are looking at from climate change that goes unchecked. According to this report, climate change could slash up to 10 percent of our gross domestic product by 2100. That is more than double the losses of the great recession.

Many of our colleagues were here during the great recession. We saw what happened. Unemployment was over 10 percent. Banks basically stopped lending. Access to capital was greatly impeded. Trade slowed down dramatically. It was a miserable time. We fought very hard to get out of it. We are now in the ninth longest running economic expansion in the history of the country, and stuff like this is not going to help extend that recovery. To refuse to act would be to willingly usher in an economic calamity twice as painful as the great recession.

The numbers and facts don't lie. The reality of climate change is scary, especially for coastal States like mine—the lowest lying State in our country. Our State is sinking instead of rising.

The facts that this report so clearly lays out affect all of us. It doesn't matter whether you are from a coastal State, like some of us, or from a landlocked State, like our Presiding Officer—if you care about public health or the environment or if you care about our economy or national security, this report says that every sector of our economy and every person living in

this country will be affected by climate change if we do nothing.

As I see it, we have a couple of options. We can take up this fight and get serious about addressing and adapting to climate change, or we can stick our heads in the sand, as some would do, ignore the facts, and do nothing, dooming our children and our grandchildren to live in a world that is less healthy, less safe, less stable, and less economically vibrant. I say, let's fight. My hope is that our colleagues will join us and not fight against one another but fight against this threat we all face.

We have one planet. President Macron from France was down the hall about 2 years ago and spoke to a joint session of Congress. There is no plan B. We have the only planet. It is the one we have been given to take care of by our Heavenly Father, and we need to take that responsibility seriously.

All right. That is the bad news. That is a lot of bad news in 10 minutes. Before I yield to my friend from Florida, I will say this: There is some good news too. The good news is, there are ways to address these challenges—the economic challenges, the agricultural challenges, the flooding challenges, the temperature challenges. There is a way to do it. Among the smart ways to do it is to reduce the emission of carbon in this country.

The good news is, we can do that by adding and creating jobs. Two hundred million people went to work in this country today—roughly 200 million. Three million people went to work in jobs where they are involved in renewable energy, energy conservation—things that help save our planet and preserve the quality of life on our planet. There are a lot more jobs we can add in that kind of work, including building vehicles that run on batteries—and we are making great progress—and vehicles that run on hydrogen and fuel cells. The only waste product from those vehicles is water. You can drink it.

There are ways to address all these threats in a way that is economically viable. We don't have to choose between all this doom and gloom and a strong economy; we can address the doom and gloom and add a lot of jobs, and we ought to do this. It is going to be a win-win. We ought to seize the day.

I thank my colleague from Florida for his patience with me here today. I don't know if I will have a chance to stand here this close with him again before he prepares to head off into the sunset. He and I were privileged to serve together in the House. He was at one time treasurer and insurance commissioner of his State, and I was treasurer of Delaware. We walked the path together for a long time, and he has been a great servant of the people of Florida for many years. I have always been proud to stand next to him, and I am especially proud today.

I am happy to yield to my friend from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the subject the Senator from Delaware speaks of—climate change especially—affects my State of Florida, as we are ground zero with so many of the consequences of climate change—the sea level rise. I will be addressing that topic within the next couple of days. I have addressed that problem over and over, but I want to give a concluding speech on that topic.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, this afternoon, I want to give a concluding speech on the topic of healthcare. I want to talk about the importance of ensuring that all Americans—and especially my State, all Floridians—have access to critical health services through the Affordable Care Act.

When the ACA passed, it stated that an insurance company cannot deny health insurance coverage because a person had a preexisting condition. In other words, that means you cannot be denied health coverage because you have something like asthma, cancer, heart trouble, diabetes, ALS, or, in some cases, even a rash. Before the Affordable Care Act, even being a woman was considered a preexisting condition.

Nearly everyone has a preexisting condition. In Florida alone, almost 8 million people have a preexisting condition. We think of our neighbors, our friends and family members, and we thought of them when we passed the ACA. We worked very hard to give them the healthcare protections they needed.

In these past few years, I have talked to folks all over our country. In Florida, I have talked to the very folks we fought so hard to ensure they have health insurance and healthcare. Last year, for example, I spoke with a well-known community leader from Hollywood, FL—Elaine Geller. Her daughter, Megan, was diagnosed with leukemia at the age of 26. At the time she was admitted to the hospital, Megan's blood count was 4. She had water on the heart. She had pneumonia. She went through one round of chemo, and it put the cancer in remission. She was initially hospitalized in New York, where she had been working as a special-ed teacher, but she returned to Florida to receive care at the University of Miami's Comprehensive Cancer Center—one of the finest cancer centers around the country.

As the story goes, Megan's doctor told Megan and her mom, Elaine, that she needed a transplant, which required a payment of \$150,000 upfront. From January until about the end of April, Megan lived at that Comprehensive Cancer Center at the university and received multiple rounds of chemo, biopsies, and various other treatments. Do you know what her mom said to me? She said that thanks to the Affordable Care Act, as a mom, she could focus all of her energy on her daughter. She didn't have to worry about all the