

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Beach nomination?

Mr. JOHNSON. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sinema
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Harris	Rosen
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Leahy	Udall
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	

NOT VOTING—1

Murray

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each and with 30 minutes controlled by the Senator from Iowa, Ms. ERNST, or her designee.

The Senator from Wyoming.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss the so-called Green New Deal.

America needs every form of energy in order to succeed, but the Democrats' extreme Green New Deal would send our strong, healthy, and growing economy over a liberal cliff. This radical plan would eliminate fossil fuels by requiring 100-percent renewable, carbon-free fuels in just 10 years.

Clearly, we realize that the climate is changing and that the global community has a collective duty to deal with this and to address it. Renewables like wind and solar are certainly a key part of the solution, but still, in the United States today, wind and solar provide only 8 percent of our power. Abundant, reliable, and affordable fossil fuels, like coal and natural gas, power about three out of five U.S. homes and businesses. Excluding them would harm our national security; it would make us dependent on foreign energy; it would destroy jobs; and it would reduce our quality of life.

In a letter sent to the Green New Deal's sponsors, the AFL-CIO—the Nation's federation of labor unions that represents about 12½ million employees and 55 different unions—called the plan a threat to U.S. workers. The letter reads: "We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families."

Those at the AFL-CIO also say the plan is not achievable or realistic, and I agree with them. By themselves, renewables can't keep the lights on, and an all-renewable energy electric power grid would collapse. This isn't serious environmental policy—it is a pipe dream.

The Democrats have yet to provide a cost estimate for the Green New Deal. One analysis by the former Director of the Congressional Budget Office estimates it could cost up to \$93 trillion—with a "t." That is more than the U.S. Government has spent in our Nation's entire history—combined. We are \$22 trillion in debt right now. So how are we going to pay for it—by borrowing more money we don't have or by hiking taxes?

The crushing burden is going to fall the hardest on working families. To get to this number, it would drain every person's checkbook in America, starting with Warren Buffett and going all the way down. The Green New Deal would cost every American family as much as \$65,000 a year every year. That is more than the average family makes in America. In Wyoming, where the average family's income is way above average, it would cost the family \$61,000 a year.

Despite the heavy toll it would take, the Green New Deal would still fail to significantly lower the Earth's temperature. Already, America leads the world in reducing carbon emissions. In 2017, the U.S. produced just 13 percent of the global emissions, and China and India combined produced 33 percent.

Let's take a look at this from a global standpoint. To me, it doesn't make any sense at all to destroy our competitive economy and allow the biggest polluters to continue to prioritize growth at our expense. Backbreaking tax increases and heavyhanded mandates are not the answer. The solution is to promote free market innovation, and the Republicans continue to advance several innovative strategies for reducing emissions.

First, we are encouraging carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration technologies. That means actually capturing carbon and using it productively for medical products, for construction products.

There are things we can actually do. Last year, we passed a bipartisan bill in this body that was signed into law. It is called the FUTURE Act, and it expands tax credits for capturing carbon.

The Clean Air Task Force calls it one of the most important bills for reducing global warming pollution in the last two decades.

Our carbon capture work continues with the bipartisan USE IT Act, which is going to help turn captured emissions into valuable products.

The other thing we are promoting is advanced nuclear power technologies. Nuclear power has helped lower emissions by providing most of America's carbon-free energy.

In late December, we passed the bipartisan Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act. This law will help innovators develop new-age nuclear reactors that are cheaper, better, and more reliable.

We also have extended the nuclear tax credit to speed completion of two new nuclear reactors. We are going to speed that completion—the first in a generation. Together they will prevent 10 million tons of emissions every year.

Third, we are encouraging an increase in the use of renewables. Republicans have repeatedly passed tax incentives to promote clean energy.

These include tax credits for wind, for solar panels, as well as incentives for biodiesel and compressed natural gas. The clean energy strategies that Republicans have been working on in a bipartisan way are working because America leads the world in reducing energy-related emissions.

Since 2007, U.S. emissions have been down 14 percent. This progress is the result of innovation. So let's continue to promote proven solutions. Let's reject the Democrats' Green New Deal as unreasonable, unworkable, and unaffordable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, last week, I joined several of my colleagues to highlight the unrealistic and unreasonable and impractical ideas of the Green New Deal—the staggering cost, which is more than the Federal Government has spent in our history; the misguided assumptions about what it

would take to decarbonize the U.S. economy on such an aggressive timeline; and the sorts of social programs that fundamentally change the United States, and, I would add, not in a good way, in my opinion.

But the worst part that has been talked about is a point I made last week. This resolution, this green deal resolution, dismisses or ignores the realistic and pragmatic environmental solutions that this Congress and past Congresses have already been working on.

I serve on the Environment and Public Works Committee with Chairman BARRASSO, who just spoke, and we have been working together in many different areas to get the same sorts of ends.

The supporters of the Green New Deal actually claim Congress has done nothing. Unfortunately, some in the media and some others seem to be reiterating that same message.

As in so many policy arenas, the latest shiny object distracts from the great bipartisan work that is being done in these Halls—work that sometimes just doesn't get noticed—and that is exactly what is happening here.

Well, today I would like to highlight some of the practical, realistic, bipartisan efforts that will put us on the right path without killing jobs or overburdening Americans with government spending and higher costs.

Just yesterday, President Trump signed into law the bipartisan lands package we passed in the Senate last month, and it was an overwhelming vote. As part of that legislation, we permanently reauthorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is a critical resource for protecting and preserving some of our country's most beautiful public lands, including those in my State of West Virginia.

Another example of the legislative solutions that we have advanced is the FUTURE Act, which I led with my Democratic colleagues, former Senator Heidi Heitkamp from North Dakota and Senator WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island, along with Chairman BARRASSO. That legislation had a bipartisan group of 25 cosponsors and the support of an incredibly diverse and broad coalition of supporters: environmental groups, oil and gas companies, Governors from around the country, and labor unions.

What cause could bring these diverse stakeholders together? Carbon capture utilization and storage—CCUS.

The FUTURE Act reauthorized and improved the section 45Q tax credit for CCUS, and it requires the certainty that the carbon stays captured for good and is used in real products for market potential.

It is not about research and development. There are other Federal programs that are reserved for that important endeavor. It is about establishing real incentives for the commercial deployment of CCUS technologies and establishing a national market for carbon.

Only a market-based solution like the FUTURE Act can lead to broad adoption of CCUS. And CCUS is something that the International Panel on Climate Change at the U.N. and several other climate and scientific organizations say must be a part of the international solution to this global challenge.

The FUTURE Act also includes support for direct-air capture projects, and that means not just from a power source or some other manufacturing source. It is actually capturing it in the free air in the environment, which can literally pull CO<sub>2</sub> out of the atmosphere for storage or use in marketable products. That can work to make new industries carbon-negative and carbon-neutral.

The United States can be a leader in this space because the environment is a global concern, and we can't control other countries' industrial and environmental policies, nor do we want them controlling ours.

With CCUS and direct-air capture, not only can we cut our emissions while maintaining high-paying coal, gas, oil, and manufacturing jobs, but we can also capture emissions emitted abroad and use them in value-added products.

The FUTURE Act was passed as part of the bipartisan Budget Act last Congress, and we are already seeing new projects being proposed to benefit from this policy. Even more will be coming forward as we build on this success, and that is where the USE IT Act comes in.

We introduced that legislation with the same group of cosponsors with Environment and Public Works Committee Ranking Member CARPER stepping in for Senator Heitkamp. We have a similar coalition of supporters across industry, environmental groups, State governments, and labor.

The USE IT Act will direct an inter-agency council to review the guidelines and create a playbook for permitting CCUS projects and associated carbon dioxide pipelines. This certainty from Federal Agencies is essential so that those seeking to utilize the 45Q tax credit that I talked about previously in the FUTURE Act can do so before it expires.

I look forward to advancing this legislation in Congress. We have already had a hearing on it—a very great bipartisan hearing on this—and I look forward to furthering our achievements in the CCUS space.

The FUTURE Act also includes seed money for breakthrough innovations in carbon capture. This expands on the good work that is already being done in CCUS research and development, primarily through the funding of the Fossil Energy Research and Development Office.

Congress has invested more than \$4 billion in CCUS through that program alone, in addition to several other programs to make more efficient and environmentally sound use of our fossil re-

sources. Some of these breakthroughs are being developed at the National Energy Technology Lab in Morgantown, WV, in conjunction with outside partners like West Virginia University.

I will continue to advocate for this kind of robust funding for these sorts of innovative energy programs, and I will support improving energy efficiency and ensuring that the United States remains a leader in carbon-free nuclear energy.

Doing the hard-nosed legislating and coalition building to achieve these goals is tough enough without all of the noise around a Green New Deal. Despite this distraction, I am confident we can continue to notch wins in this arena. We have to because there is simply too much riding on it for our economy and for our environment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, when it comes to bankrupting our country, the Green New Deal puts all other ideas to shame. It calls for rebuilding or retrofitting every building in America in the next 10 years, eliminating all fossil fuels in 10 years, eliminating nuclear power, and working toward ending air travel. This Green New Deal is not a serious policy idea; it is a unicorn.

Democrats failed to grasp something basic: Republicans and Independents care about the environment. We want clean air, we want clean water, and we want to take care of our environment and natural resources. At the same time, we also care about our economy, jobs for families in our States, and making sure that everyone in our country has the opportunity to succeed. We believe that taking care of the planet and working to create a better economy are objectives that can and must be pursued at the exact same time.

You can't afford to take care of the environment if you don't have a strong economy. The Green New Deal would destroy our economy. To embrace this Green New Deal plan is to be an enemy of the American economy and the American worker because when you stop and think about it, the Green New Deal is, in reality, the green job killer.

Some will say: Why bother picking on this plan? It is not like it has any chance of being enacted.

Here is the problem: A socialist from New York City with a massive Twitter following introduced this nonserious plan, and every single major Democrat running for President immediately embraced it. Let that sink in for a moment.

Climate change is real and requires real solutions, but the Democratic Party has accepted this economy-destroying new deal as a new commandment to go alongside single-payer healthcare and higher taxes on job creators.

For most Americans, this plan is a declaration of war on the economy, our

way of life, and the standard of living for working class families across our great country.

What does this mean for Florida? Well, it would mean the end of the tourism industry; that is, 1.4 million jobs, massive job loss, and unemployment.

As for me, I love and cherish the environment. It is what makes the great State of Florida so great. What I don't love are naive plans that would destroy Florida's economy.

During my time as Governor of Florida, we made record investments in our environment, and we were able to do that only because Florida's economy was booming and we had the resources to make these investments. The Green New Deal would reverse every ounce of progress we have made.

The most incredible part of the Green New Deal plan is the statement that they will provide "economic security for all people of the United States." No government can ever do that. To argue otherwise is a disservice to all hard-working Americans and nothing more than phony political posturing.

I look forward to a time when we don't have to argue about ridiculous proposals being amplified in the media and can actually focus on real solutions to protect our environment and build our economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the so-called Green New Deal and its impact on Indiana's agricultural community and our Hoosier farmers.

As I said last week, this misguided Green New Deal is unaffordable, unattainable, and unrealistic. In fact, over the next decade, this so-called deal would cost up to \$65,000 per American household per year.

This proposal is a job killer, and it is bad news for hard-working Hoosiers. This is especially true for Hoosiers who rely on our vital agriculture industry for their incomes.

Allow me to run through a few numbers. In Indiana, agriculture supports more than 107,000 Hoosier jobs. Agriculture also contributes an estimated \$30 billion to Indiana's economy. Indiana is the 10th largest farming state in the Nation, and we are the 8th largest ag export. Perhaps most importantly, 97 percent of Hoosier farms are family owned or operated.

Agriculture is a main driver of our State's economy. It is often said that Indiana feeds the world, and we take a lot of pride in that. We need our ag community to continue thriving. Yet the sponsors of this Green New Deal have spoken about cutting back on the farming practices that employ Hoosiers and put food on the table.

Imagine the crushing cost to Hoosier farmers of changing out all farm equipment for electric vehicles or the cost of upgrading every single building on every farm in Indiana. This is on top of

the sharp climb in energy prices that we would see under the Green New Deal. This bad deal would force the cost of doing business to skyrocket for Hoosier manufacturers and our farmers, which would mean higher prices for consumers and less money in the pockets of hard-working Hoosiers.

Jim, a small business owner from Muncie, wrote to my office recently. He said: "Please stop the Green New Deal in its tracks NOW."

I also heard from Patrick in Bloomington, who said: "As a man who has served my country in combat in Vietnam 50 years ago and someone who loves my country deeply—I am very concerned about the direction our nation is heading." Regarding the Green New Deal, he added: "I hope you won't give this idea a second thought."

Dennis from Greenwood wrote: "My wife and I are strongly against the 'Green New Deal'. . . . We would recommend that you not support this crazy idea."

Well, Dennis, I don't intend to.

Susan from Lafayette wrote: "Please hold strong and promote the values of Indiana and many Americans. . . ."

The bottom line is this: Hoosiers don't want this harmful Green New Deal. It sets unattainable goals that are bad for Hoosier farmers. It is bad for our economy, and it is bad for our families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

S.J. RES. 7

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking Senator MIKE LEE and Senator CHRIS MURPHY for their hard work on this important resolution—work which, in fact, has gone on now for several years.

Today is an extremely important day. Today we in the Senate have the opportunity to take a major step forward in ending the horrific war in Yemen and alleviating the terrible, terrible suffering being experienced by the people in one of the poorest countries on Earth.

Today, equally important, we can finally begin the process of reasserting Congress's responsibility over war-making. As every schoolchild should know, article I of the Constitution clearly states that it is Congress, not the President, that has the power to declare war. In their great wisdom, the Framers of our Constitution, the Founders of this country, gave that enormously important responsibility to Congress because the Members of the House and the Senate are closer and more accountable to the people of this country.

Tragically, however, over many years, Congress has abdicated that responsibility to Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents. Today we begin the process of reclaiming our constitutional authority by ending U.S. involvement in a war that has not been authorized by Congress and is clearly unconstitutional.

Last December, this body made history for the first time since the War Powers Resolution was passed in 1973. A majority of Senators—56 of us, in a bipartisan way—used those powers from the War Powers Act to end U.S. involvement in a war.

Today we consider that exact same resolution once again in the new Congress. This time, however, unlike last session, this resolution will be brought to the House floor, and I strongly believe will be passed.

Let me say a brief word about the war in Yemen.

In March of 2015, under the leadership of Muhammad bin Salman, then Saudi Defense Minister and now the Crown Prince, a Saudi-led coalition intervened in Yemen's ongoing civil war. As a result of that intervention, Yemen is now experiencing the worst humanitarian disaster on the planet.

According to the United Nations, Yemen is at risk of the most severe famine in 100 years, with some 14 million people facing the possibility of starvation. In one of the poorest countries on Earth, as a result of this war, according to the Save the Children organization, some 85,000 children in Yemen have already starved to death over the last several years—an unimaginable number, unimaginable suffering and destruction. If this war continues, what the experts tell us is that millions more will also face famine and starvation.

Further, Yemen is currently experiencing the worst cholera outbreak in the world, with as many as 10,000 new cases each week, according to the World Health Organization. This is a disease 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 people are no longer able to access clean drinking water.

The fact is that the United States, with little media attention, has been Saudi Arabia's partner in this horrific war. We have been providing the bombs that the Saudi-led coalition is using. We have been refueling their planes before they drop those bombs, and we have been 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 more. A CNN report found evidence that American weapons have been used in a string of such deadly attacks on civilians since the war began.

This past weekend—this past weekend—at least 20 women and a child were killed in a Saudi-led airstrike on Yemen's northwestern Province of Hajjah, as they huddled in a house to avoid nearby clashes. As is so often the case in war, the innocent, the women and the children, pay the price.

Late last year, I met with several brave Yemeni human rights activists.

They had come to Congress to urge us to put a stop to this war. They told me clearly: When Yemenis see “Made in America” on the bombs that are killing them, it tells them that the United States is responsible for this war. That is the sad truth.

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

Some have suggested that Congress moving to withdraw support for this war would undermine the United Nations’ efforts to reach a peace agreement, but the opposite is true. It is the promise of unconditional U.S. support for the Saudis that undermines those efforts.

We have evidence of this. Last December, as we were preparing to vote on this same resolution, we received news that U.N. Special Envoy Martin Griffiths reached a breakthrough agreement for a ceasefire in the port city of Hodeidah. That ceasefire, which is being maintained today, is enabling food and increased humanitarian aid into the country.

I have spoken to people at the highest level of those negotiations, who have made it clear that our actions here in the Senate played a significant role in pushing Saudi Arabia toward an agreement. That pressure must continue, and the resolution I hope we pass today will do just that.

Our effort on this issue has clearly made a positive impact, and I thank all of the cosponsors of this resolution for their efforts and all of the civil society organizations—progressive and conservative organizations—that have worked so hard to raise awareness of this conflict and the constitutional implications.

Above and beyond the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, this war has been harmful to our national security and 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 the Houthis is of serious concern for all of us, but the truth is that support there is far less significant than the administration claims. The fact is that the relationship between Iran and the Houthis has only been strengthened by this war. The war is creating the very problem the administration claims to want to solve.

This war is also undermining the broader effort against violent extremists. A 2016 State Department report found that the conflict had helped al-Qaida and the Islamic State’s Yemen branch “deepen their inroads across much of the country.” The head of the International Rescue Committee, former British Foreign Minister David Miliband, said in a recent interview that “the winners are the extremist groups like Al Qaeda and ISIS.” Late last year, the Wall Street Journal reported that “nearly two years after

being driven from its stronghold in Yemen, one of al Qaeda’s most dangerous franchises has entrenched itself in the country’s hinterlands as a devastating war creates the conditions for its comeback.”

Here is something that should deeply concern us all. At a time when we are spending billions to fight terrorism all over the world, a February CNN report revealed that Saudi Arabia and its coalition partners have transferred American-made weapons to al-Qaida-linked fighters in Yemen. Does anyone here think it makes sense that U.S. weapons should be given to groups who have declared war against the United States?

This war is both a humanitarian and a strategic disaster.

Let us also not forget that this war is being led by a despotic, undemocratic regime in Saudi Arabia. The United States of America—the most powerful country on Earth—should not be led into a regional war by our client states that are trying to serve their own narrow and selfish interests.

It should not be Saudi Arabia that is developing and implementing American foreign and military policy. Saudi Arabia is a monarchy controlled by one of the wealthiest families in the world—the Saud family. In a 2017 report by the Cato Institute, Saudi Arabia was ranked 149th out of 159 countries for freedom and human rights. Is this really the kind of country whose foreign policy we should be supporting with U.S. taxpayer dollars?

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 treated as third-class citizens. Women still need 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.

Last year, Saudi activist Loujain al-Hathloul, a leader in the fight for women’s rights, was kidnapped from Abu Dhabi and forced to return to the country. She is currently imprisoned, along with many other human rights activists. Human Rights Watch reported that imprisoned women activists have been subjected to torture, including electric shocks, and other forms of physical and sexual assault.

The people of the entire world received a very clear understanding of the nature of the Saudi regime with the murder of Jamal Khashoggi in the Saudi consulate in Turkey. All of the evidence suggests that the Saudi Crown Prince was directly responsible for that murder. Is that really the kind of regime whose leads we in the United States should be following?

I believe the U.S. Congress has become far too comfortable with military interventions all over the world. We have now been in Afghanistan for nearly 18 years—the longest war in Amer-

ican history. We also have troops in many other countries around the world. The time is long overdue for Congress to reassert its constitutional role in determining when and where our country goes to war. This resolution provides that opportunity.

I hope this body will do exactly as it did in December and, in a bipartisan manner, pass this resolution. The humanitarian catastrophe has only gotten worse in Yemen, and our intervention there is every bit as unconstitutional as it was when we passed this resolution in December.

Let us bring this catastrophic war in Yemen to an end. Let us focus our efforts on a diplomatic resolution to end that war. Let us provide the humanitarian aid needed to protect the hungry and the sick in Yemen. In a historic vote 45 years after the passage of the War Powers Act, let us today reassert Congress’s constitutional responsibility in terms of war-making.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Once again, I am very pleased to join my friend the Senator from Vermont on the floor to press this body to take seriously its constitutional responsibility and its responsibility to ensure that the United States doesn’t enter into hostilities abroad other than in those situations that are vitally necessary to protect our national security interests.

I am so proud to have worked with Senator SANDERS, Senator LEE, and many others here to build a truly bipartisan coalition that is going to do something that, as Senator SANDERS said, is historic.

I have been coming down to the Senate floor for 4 years now raising concerns about U.S. participation in this civil war. When the United States first entered into an agreement with the Saudis to help them in their bombing campaign, very few people could probably locate Yemen on the map. Today, it is the subject of national conversation. With passage in the Senate and the House, regardless of what the President chooses to do, the world now knows that the United States is paying attention to the world’s worst humanitarian disaster—a nightmare inside Yemen that is taking the lives of tens of thousands of people.

Sometimes humanitarian disasters and famines are caused by natural events, those that we cannot control—droughts, for instance. This is a man-made humanitarian catastrophe that the United States has something to say about, and we are going to say something about it in a matter of hours.

Let me just say a few things about what will happen if we pass this resolution and it becomes law and what will not happen if we pass this resolution and it becomes law. I think Senator SANDERS covered this, and we have covered this enough.

The first thing that happens is that we uphold the Constitution.

I get it. Declaring war is a lot tougher today than it was 40 years ago or 100 years ago. It is not as if there are big armies that march against each other across open fields. Very rarely is there a nice peace treaty signed to wrap up hostilities. Now we have shadowy and more diffuse enemies who are harder to define. We have wars that seem to never end. But that doesn't obviate Congress's responsibility to set parameters around war. Just because it is harder to declare war today doesn't mean that we still don't have the responsibility to do it.

Over and over again, we have outsourced the decision on hostilities to the President, whether it be President Obama or President Trump. In large part, it is because we just don't want to be in this business any longer.

There is no doubt that when we are helping Saudi Arabia drop bombs on churches, on weddings, on cholera treatment facilities, and on some legitimate military targets, we are engaged in a war, and we should declare it here. That is the first thing that happens.

The second thing that happens if we pass this resolution and it becomes law is that we wash our hands of the blood associated with being a participant in the creation of one of the world's worst humanitarian catastrophes.

Never has the world seen a cholera epidemic as big as this one, at least in recorded history. There is no secret as to why there is a cholera epidemic; it is because the Saudis bombed the water treatment facilities, so the water isn't clean any longer.

Whether or not the United States knew about this or signed off on it, we don't know, but the fact is, we should not be associated with a bombing campaign that the U.N. tells us is likely a gross violation of human rights.

Third, if we pass this resolution and it becomes law, peace becomes more likely.

We have evidence of why that is because when we passed this resolution in the Senate at the end of last year, not coincidentally, within days, a partial ceasefire was announced in Hodeidah. Why is that? The reason is twofold. One, when the Saudis realize they don't have a blank check from the United States any longer, they get more serious about peace. Two, the Houthis, who are the other party to this conflict and who don't believe that the United States is an honest broker or that anyone will actually be serious about enforcing concessions they give, come to the table because they see that the United States and others that we support as part of the negotiations will actually be honest brokers and that we are only willing to go so far with our Saudi partners.

The fourth thing that happens, as Senator SANDERS has mentioned, is that we are able to send a message to Saudi Arabia and specifically to the

Crown Prince that they need to change their behavior if they want to maintain this relationship.

Some people are going to vote against this because they say it has nothing to do with Jamal Khashoggi. It does. Jamal Khashoggi's name isn't in here. The names of the other American residents who are currently being detained by Saudi Arabia aren't in here. But make no mistake—Muhammad bin Salman, who ordered this campaign of political repression—his No. 1 foreign policy priority is the perpetuation of the war inside Yemen.

Given the violation of trust that has occurred with the United States over the murder of Jamal Khashoggi and the coverup of it, it stands to reason that we would rethink our association with other priorities of the Crown Prince's if he blatantly lied to us about his participation in the human rights violation that has become the obsession of this country and the world. The two are connected. This will be seen as a message to the Saudis that they need to clean up their act.

What will not happen? Casualties will not get worse. The Trump administration says: Well, if we are not part of the coalition, it just means we can't stop civilians from being killed.

Well, forgive me, but it doesn't seem like we have been doing too good of a job thus far if 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died of starvation and disease and tens of thousands of civilians have been caught in the crossfire. We can't get into classified information here, but let's just say there is a limit to what the United States can do as part of this coalition.

There is no evidence to suggest that casualties will get worse. In fact, the cover being lifted of U.S. endorsements of this bombing campaign will make it harder for the Saudis to take chances because they know they don't have the United States to fall back on.

Second, the Saudis will not go somewhere else. This idea that if we just say we are not going to participate in this one single war with you, that the Saudis will all of a sudden break relationships with the United States and go buy their military equipment from Russia, is belied by how this alliance has worked for years. The complication of the Saudis turning around and choosing to go to another partner, if that is how this works, that the nature of our relationship is one in which the United States can never ever refuse a request from the Saudis to participate in one of their military endeavors overseas, then that is not an alliance. An alliance allows you to tell your partner when you think they are wrong and choose, unless you have a treaty obligation of some sort, whether you engage with them.

Lastly, as I mentioned, some people say we will lose our political leverage; that we will make it harder for negotiations to happen. It is exactly the opposite, as evidenced by the fact that when we were debating this resolution

last time, as people were telling us that if we passed it we wouldn't have as much leverage in the negotiations, successful negotiations were being concluded in Stockholm.

This is a historic moment for the Congress to step up and say that enough is enough. We are made weaker in the eyes of the world when we willingly participate in war crimes and when we allow for our partner to engage in activity that leads to the slaughter of innocents.

Never mind the conduct of a war in which our true enemies, al-Qaida and ISIS, are getting stronger and stronger by the day. I hope we have the same bipartisan stamp of approval on this resolution today as we did last year, and I hope it stands as a new day for the Senate when we are more willing, on a bipartisan basis, to do our concurrent responsibility, along with the executive branch, to set the foreign policy of this Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to again support efforts to stop U.S. direct military support for the Saudi-led coalition efforts in Yemen.

I do not need to remind my colleagues what is at stake. Each time we have considered this resolution, the situation for Yemenis is even more dire.

Now in its fourth year, this conflict has put nearly 16 million people on the brink of starvation, including 400,000 children who are severely malnourished, displaced more than 3 million people, and done nothing to increase stability or prosperity for the people of Yemen. In fact, the longer this conflict goes on, the larger Iran's foothold in Yemen grows and the more entrenched opposing political factions become.

In addition to the horrifying humanitarian crisis, we have also learned that U.S. coalition partners may be transferring U.S.-origin weapons to known—underline known—terrorist organizations. We have read alarming reports about torture and abuse in prisons throughout Yemen—both Houthi and coalition controlled.

I will simply repeat what I have said before. It is in the interest of the United States to put as much political pressure on the parties to end this conflict as we can. Yes, we have strategic partnerships with Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, but we must find a way forward to get those relationships on a path that truly serves U.S. interests.

To be clear, the Houthis bear significant responsibility in the deterioration of the state of affairs in Yemen, and that is without a doubt. We do not have diplomatic relations with the Houthis, and we certainly don't sell them arms or provide active military support. This resolution is a good first step, but what we really need is a comprehensive approach to address our interests in the gulf.

Along with Senators YOUNG, REED, GRAHAM, SHAHEEN, COLLINS, and MURPHY, I introduced the comprehensive Saudi Arabia Accountability and Yemen Act. The bill calls for a suspension of offensive weapons sales to Saudi Arabia, sanctions all persons responsible for blocking humanitarian access in Yemen or supporting the Houthis in Yemen, and urges accountability for all actors in Yemen guilty of war crimes.

Finally, it also addresses some of the most reckless Saudi actions by calling for true accountability for those responsible for the murder of American resident and journalist, Jamal Khashoggi, and a report on human rights in Saudi Arabia.

I support this resolution and encourage us to continue to debate. We must evaluate our relationship with these partners and find a path forward not just in Yemen but indeed in the entire gulf region that truly promotes American interests and American values.

Today is a day we can make a clear and unequivocal statement that we do not support this continuing conflict and humanitarian disaster. There is a consequence for acting in the way the coalition has—in many cases, clearly, irresponsibly, with the reckless loss of human life. I hope we can continue to work to go beyond that so we can deal with the entire region's challenges.

I look forward to whatever is the agreement on amendments that may be considered here. I personally would like to see us get an up-or-down vote as a resolution. I understand there may be some amendments.

Depending upon what amendments are made in order, I may seek a second-degree amendment at the end of the day. I am concerned that one of these amendments that are contemplated may be well-intentioned but also may very well be used in such a way to actually undermine the very essence of the underlying vote we are taking.

I will reserve my judgment until that time on that, but in the interim, I urge all of my colleagues to continue to support it, as they did in the last vote on this question of this resolution.

I yield the floor.

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. LEE. 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. LEE. Mr. President, I stand with Senator SANDERS and with Senator MURPHY as a cosponsor of the legislation before us, S.J. Res. 7, which would remove U.S. Armed Forces from Saudi Arabia's war in Yemen.

There were 56 Senators who voted in favor of this resolution just a few months ago, in December, or at the end of the last Congress. That vote was, of course, a victory for the Constitution

and for the separation of powers, to say nothing of prudence, of peace, and of justice. The House of Representatives passed its own version of this resolution earlier this year. Now it is back to us. Now it is our turn. Now it is our job to get this passed. We have the opportunity today to reassert Congress's constitutional role over declaring war and over putting American blood and treasure on the line.

In this particular case, the evidence is clear that we ought not be involved in this unconstitutional, unjustified, and, ultimately, immoral war. The Yemeni war has claimed the lives of tens of thousands of people, including those of countless innocent civilians. It has created countless refugees, orphans, widows, and it has also displaced countless families. The numbers are nothing short of staggering.

Since 2015, more than 6,000 civilians have died, and more than 10,000 have been wounded. The majority of these casualties—over 10,000 of them—has been as the result of airstrikes led by the Saudi-led coalition. In one attack last year, the Saudis dropped a U.S.-made bomb on a schoolbus that killed 40 young children on a school trip and wounded another 30 children in addition to that.

Yemen is now facing rampant disease and mass starvation. An estimated 15 million people do not have access to clean water and sanitation, and 17 million don't have access to food. Photographs from Yemen depict malnourished children who have every rib in their tiny bodies exposed and jetting out as manifestations of their starvation. Over 85,000 children have died of starvation since 2015.

In short, the situation in Yemen has become the worst humanitarian crisis in the world, and the United States has been abating the horrors of this war. Indeed, our country has actually made the crisis worse by helping one side bomb innocent civilians. I don't say that lightly. It is with great soberness that I raise this very real and very serious accusation.

So it begs the question: How did we get entangled in this crisis to begin with? How did we get involved? Why and how and under what circumstances did this become our war to fight?

In March of 2015, Saudi Arabia launched a war against the Houthi rebels. Shortly after the Houthis ousted the Saudi-backed government in the capital city of Sanaa, the Obama administration—without consulting Congress, of course—authorized U.S. military forces to provide logistical and intelligence support to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia-led coalition fighting that war. U.S. military support has continued ever since then, for the last 4 years, including with midair refueling, surveillance, reconnaissance information, and target selection assistance. In other words, we have been supporting and, in fact, have been actively participating in the activities of war. We are involved in this conflict as, no less, cobelligerents.

Some of my colleagues have argued to the contrary and have suggested that we are somehow not involved in this war in Yemen. Yet, if we are honest with ourselves, we know that isn't true. We know that this argument falls dead flat on its face. As Defense Secretary Jim Mattis himself acknowledged in December of 2017, just a little over a year ago, our military has been helping the Saudis with target selection assistance or with "making certain they hit the right thing."

In other words, we are helping a foreign power bomb its adversaries in what is, undoubtedly, indisputably, a war. Previously, we were helping them even with midair refueling assistance—that is, helping Saudi jets that were en route to bombing missions and other combat missions on the ground inside of Yemen. If that doesn't constitute direct involvement in a war, I don't know what does.

Other opponents of our resolution claim somehow that our involvement in Yemen is constitutional, that it is lawful under the War Powers Act of 1973. It is true that under the War Powers Act, the executive branch is authorized to use Armed Forces in cases of emergencies and in other certain, rigid, well-established time constraints. Yet, you see, the conflict in Yemen does not constitute a threat to the safety of American citizens, and our involvement has far surpassed any emergency time allotted under the War Powers Resolution.

The Houthis, while, perhaps, no friends of the American people, make up a regional rebel group that does not itself threaten American national security. In fact, the longer we fight against it, the more we give reason to it to hate America and to embrace the opportunists who are our true enemies in the region—those who make up the regime in power in Iran. The more we prolong the activities that destabilize this region, the longer we harm our own interests in terms of trade and broader regional security.

The War Powers Act also states that the assignment of U.S. Armed Forces to coordinate and to participate in the hostilities of a foreign power, of a foreign country, itself constitutes a conflict of war. Some have argued that we have not been engaging in hostilities and, therefore, somehow, have not violated the War Powers Act. This claim falls flat in several respects.

First, the claim itself is categorically untrue. As we heard before, we are literally telling the Saudis what to bomb, what to hit, and what and whom to take out.

Second, these opponents are relying on an old, 1976 memorandum that is internal to the executive branch and internal to the Department of Defense itself that was written by a lawyer within the Department of Defense. Talk about the fox guarding the henhouse. It defers to a Department of Defense lawyer's memorandum from 1976 that uses an unreasonably,



unsustainably, indefensibly slim definition of the word “hostilities.” This definition may or may not have been relevant then. I don’t know. I was only 5 years old at the time it was written. Yet we no longer live in a world in which “war” means exclusively two competing countries that are lined up on opposite ends of the battlefield, in two columns, and that are engaged in direct exchanges of fire across the same ground. That is not how war is waged anymore.

War activities, of course, have changed dramatically since 1976. Like bell-bottoms and so many fads of that era, this is a dynamic that has changed today. Our war in today’s America increasingly relies on high technology and on high-technology solutions. Our wars have involved cyber activity, reconnaissance, surveillance, and high-tech target selection. These, by the way, are the precise activities that we ourselves are undertaking in Yemen. It is not just that we are involved somehow on the sidelines. These activities themselves constitute war.

Even aside from this overly narrow, cramped, and indefensible definition of the word “hostilities” and separate and apart from the definition of the word “hostilities,” under the War Powers Act, we ourselves do not have to technically be involved in hostilities in order to trigger the responsibilities of the Congress under the War Powers Act in order to make sure that the legislative branch actually does its job to declare war or to authorize the use of military force under the War Powers Act and under the Constitution. The War Powers Act, in fact, is triggered so long as we are sufficiently involved with the armed forces of another nation when those armed forces of another nation are themselves involved in hostilities, which they indisputably are.

The Saudi-led coalition directing the activities in the civil war in Yemen against the Houthis is undeniably involved in hostilities. We are undeniably assisting the coalition in those movements, in those activities, in those acts of war. We, therefore, by definition under the plain language of the War Powers Act itself, are subjected to the terms of the War Powers Act. The Saudis are, without question, involved in those hostilities. We can’t doubt that. No one here can credibly claim to the contrary.

Finally, some argue that this resolution might somehow harm or undermine or hurt our efforts to combat terrorism in the region specifically with regard to al-Qaida and ISIS. Importantly, however, this resolution explicitly states that the resolution would not impede the military’s ability to fight these terror groups. In fact, U.S. involvement in Yemen has, arguably, undermined the effort against al-Qaida’s affiliates. The State Department’s Country Reports on Terrorism for 2016 found that the conflict between the Saudi-led forces and Houthi insur-

gents has actually helped al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, or AQAP, as it is often described, and ISIS’ Yemen branch to “deepen their inroads across much of the country.”

It appears that our involvement in Yemen accomplishes no good at all, only harm—and significant harm at that. Recent events are bringing that into an even clearer light. In October, there was the killing of Jamal Khashoggi. Then, just the week before last, news broke that the Saudis tortured a man while he was detained there in 2017. He had dual citizenship in the United States and Saudi Arabia. Shortly before that, a report also came out that suggested that Saudi Arabia had transferred American-made, American-manufactured weapons to al-Qaida-linked fighters and to other militant groups. In other words, the Saudis are likely using our own weapons in violation of our own end-user agreements with them, by the way, to commit these atrocities of war. That is not OK.

It is becoming clearer and clearer that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is not an ally that deserves our unwavering, unquestioning, unflinching support. It is not an ally that deserves our support or our military intervention, especially when our own security—the safety of the American people—is not on the line, and I haven’t heard anyone in this body maintain otherwise.

Indeed, perhaps we ought not be supporting this regime at all. At a bare minimum, we ought not be deferring unflinchingly to this regime, and we ought not be fighting an unjust war on its behalf half a world away, putting at risk not only U.S. treasure but also, potentially, U.S. blood and the blood of countless innocent civilians who are in the line of fire as a result of this. To the contrary, to continue supporting them in this war would be bad diplomacy and would undermine our very credibility on the world stage.

Look, regardless of where you stand on this war, these decisions matter, and we ought to take them seriously. In fact, each and every one of us has sworn an oath to take things like this seriously.

The Constitution puts the war-making power—the power to declare war—in the hands of Congress. There was a good reason for this. It has everything to do with the fact that Congress is the branch of the Federal Government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals, and our Founding Fathers wisely understood that it was dangerous to allow the powers of government to accumulate in the hands of the few or in the hands of one person.

One of the reasons they put the war-making power in the hands of Congress is they wanted to make a strong break away from the system that had evolved in our old system of government, the one involved in our old capital based in London, where the chief executive himself had the power unilaterally to make war.

This was a decided break from that tradition. There were other traditions that we continued, that we adopted. Many of our rights, our liberties, our processes in government were patterned after the British model. This one was not. It was deliberately the choice of the Founding Fathers not to continue with that tradition, and that is why we and only we can declare war.

You see, it is not that we are flawless. It is not that we are any smarter than people in other branches. Quite to the contrary, it has only to do—and everything to do—with the fact that we are more accountable to the people at more routine intervals.

When you put the power to declare war or authorize the use of military force in Congress, you guarantee that this decision will be made carefully and deliberately in full view of the American people. Public debates have a way of bringing the American people into the discussion, into the deliberation.

You see, there is no such thing as a clean war. There is no such thing as a war that is detached from moral peril, from moral consequences, from grave and heartbreaking results in which innocent men, women, and children lose their lives or are subjected to the worst privations known to human beings.

It is for that very reason that we owe it to those affected by war—not just the brave men and women who fight for us and protect us but for people all over the world and for the good name of the United States to be protected—that as we publicly debate the moral consequences of war, the grave implications that war has for our country and others involved in the conflict are the business of all of the American people and should never be reserved for one person.

We need to carefully weigh the risks and merits of engaging in any conflict in an open and in an honest manner. So instead of placing this power in the hands of a King or even just in the executive branch generally where it can be used unilaterally to declare war, the Founders placed it here in Congress, knowing that we are more accountable to the people than the other branches, and the power would be less likely to be abused here.

There is a lot at stake. There is a lot at stake whenever the lives of American military personnel are placed on the line and whenever the lives of innocent men, women, and children are on the line, too—precious lives, each of immeasurable worth. These decisions result in the shedding of blood, the shedding of blood that will be on our hands if we fail both to exercise our constitutional prerogatives and to take that very responsibility very seriously.

Over the last 80 years, we have tragically seen what happens when the muscle of the legislative branch begins to atrophy as a result of the failure of those who occupy these very seats to exercise their legislative muscle. When we fail to exercise that power that the

Constitution entrusts to us, entrusted to us in that document to which each of us has taken an oath, we imperil the entire system and the safety of our country. We also cheapen the moral certainty with which our Armed Forces need to be able to proceed in order to make what they do right and legally and morally justifiable.

So today, I respectfully and with all the passion and energy I am capable of communicating urge my colleagues once again to vote to end our involvement in this unauthorized, unjustified, unconstitutional, and immoral war.

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

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 7 and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S.J. Res. 7. I further ask that there be 2 hours of debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with 10 minutes of the Democratic time being reserved for Senator MENENDEZ; further, that the following amendments be called up and reported by number, Paul amendment No. 193, Inhofe amendment No. 194, and Rubio amendment No. 195; further, that no other first-degree amendments be in order and no second-degree amendments be in order prior to a vote in relation to these amendments; finally, that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed and that following the disposition of the amendments, the joint resolution, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution as amended, if amended, with 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

Thereupon, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

**AMENDMENTS NOS. 193, 194, AND 195**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments by number.

The bill clerk read the amendments as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE], for others, proposes amendments numbered 193, 194, and 195.

The amendments are as follows:

**AMENDMENT NO. 193**

(Purpose: To provide that nothing in the joint resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force)

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 6. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING NO AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.**

Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), nothing in this joint resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

**AMENDMENT NO. 194**

(Purpose: To provide an exception for supporting efforts to defend against ballistic missile, cruise missile, and unmanned aerial vehicle threats to civilian population centers in coalition countries, including locations where citizens and nationals of the United States reside)

On page 5, line 7, insert after "associated forces" the following: "or operations to support efforts to defend against ballistic missile, cruise missile, and unmanned aerial vehicle threats to civilian population centers in coalition countries, including locations where citizens and nationals of the United States reside".

**AMENDMENT NO. 195**

(Purpose: To provide a rule of construction regarding intelligence sharing)

Insert after section 3 the following new section:

**SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTELLIGENCE SHARING.**

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities relating to threats in or emanating from Yemen conducted by, or in conjunction with, the United States Government involving—

- (1) the collection of intelligence;
- (2) the analysis of intelligence; or
- (3) the sharing of intelligence between the United States and any coalition partner if the President determines such sharing is appropriate and in the national security interests of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, just like last year, I remain deeply concerned about the humanitarian situation in Yemen, as well as the erratic behavior of Saudi Arabia's leadership. We have all suffered through that.

However, I oppose the resolution brought forth by Senators LEE, MURPHY, and SANDERS, which, if implemented, would end all security cooperation with our partners in Yemen against the Houthis.

First of all, we are not engaged in hostilities in Yemen against the Houthis, and here is what we are doing in Yemen: We are providing intelligence support that helps construct no-strike lists that enable humanitarian efforts and protect humanitarian aid workers.

Some of these workers are workers we are very close to—our allies. Our intelligence support is also vital to assisting our partners in defending themselves against the Iranian-supported ballistic missile attacks.

It is important to emphasize that our partners are the tip of the spear, not us. Beyond this, our security cooperation provides leverage that we have used with the Saudi-led coalition to advance peace negotiations.

If we pull that support, here is what we can expect: Israel loses, Iran wins, and the humanitarian situation will

get worse. I think we all understand that.

Our partners will be less capable to confront the lethal ballistic missile threat, and peace efforts will lose a vital line of support. Moreover, if a ballistic missile hits a population center and kills Americans because we, due to the resolution, withheld intelligence, it would be unforgivable. That is why I introduced an amendment to specifically protect our civilian population.

In closing, the vote is not about whether we approve of Saudi Arabia's behavior; I don't. It is about whether we will use our leverage with the Saudi-led coalition to ensure humanitarian access and promote peace, and, more fundamentally, it is about whether we take seriously our responsibility to keep Americans safe. That is really what this is all about. It merely includes that we would eliminate the threats to civilian population centers in coalition countries, including locations where citizens and nationals of the United States reside. I can't imagine anyone would be opposed to that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

**DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY**

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to support the joint resolution of disapproval and to urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Let's be clear, there is no national security emergency at the southwestern border. The President and his administration continue to mislead Americans about what really is happening at the border in order to fulfill a misguided campaign promise to build a wall. After weeks of threats and toying with the idea of declaring a national emergency to circumvent Congress, the President, in my view, wrongly issued such a proclamation on February 15 under the authority of the National Emergencies Act.

This proclamation redirects military construction funds provided by Congress to the Department of Defense for projects deemed important to the readiness, welfare, and missions of our Armed Forces. This action is an extreme overreach of Executive authority. No President has ever declared a national emergency to circumvent Congress for a construction project he failed to get approved through legislation.

In fact, this authority to use military construction funds in an emergency has only been used twice for projects in the United States—first by President George Herbert Walker Bush during Operation Desert Shield and then by President George W. Bush in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks—and those projects addressed