

and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Graham	Peters
Baldwin	Grassley	Portman
Barrasso	Harris	Reed
Blackburn	Hassan	Risch
Blumenthal	Hawley	Roberts
Blunt	Heinrich	Romney
Boozman	Hirono	Rosen
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Capito
Burr	Inhofe	Carper
Cantwell	Isakson	Casey
Capito	Schatz	Cassidy
Cardin	Johnson	Collins
Cardin	Jones	Coons
Carper	Kaine	Cotton
Casey	Kennedy	Cramer
Cassidy	King	Crasto
Collins	Klobuchar	Cantwell
Coons	Lankford	Cardin
Cornyn	Leahy	Klobuchar
Cortez Masto	Lee	Cortez Masto
Cotton	Manchin	Duckworth
Cramer	Markay	Durbin
Crasto	McConnell	Feinstein
Cruz	McSally	Gillibrand
Daines	Menendez	Harris
Duckworth	Merkley	
Durbin	Moran	
Ernst	Murkowski	
Feinstein	Murphy	
Fischer	Murray	
Gardner	Paul	
	Perdue	

NAYS—3

Gillibrand	Sanders	Warren
Bennet	Booker	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 action.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Joshua Wolson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Wolson nomination?

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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 Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 93 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Burr	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Isakson	Rubio
Carper	Johnson	Sasse
Casey	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	King	Shaheen
Coons	Lankford	Shelby
Cornyn	Leahy	Sinema
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Manchin	Tester
Cramer	McCormick	Thune
Crasto	Cruz	McSally
Cruz	Daines	Tillis
Daines	Enzi	Murkowski
Duckworth	Ernst	Toomey
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Warren	Young
Feinstein	Warren	
Fischer	Wyden	
Gardner	Young	

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Collins	Brown	Schumer
Coons	Cantwell	Smith
Cornyn	Cardin	Klobuchar
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cotton	Markay	Udall
Cramer	Duckworth	Van Hollen
Crasto	Menendez	Merkley
Cruz	Tillis	Warner
Daines	Feinstein	Murphy
Duckworth	Gillibrand	Warren
Durbin	Harris	Whitehouse
Ernst	Reed	Wyden
Feinstein		
Fischer		
Gardner		

NOT VOTING—2

Bennet	Booker
--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 action.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session to resume consideration of the veto message on S.J. Res. 7, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

(The remarks of Senator CORNYN pertaining to the submission of S. 1303 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Arkansas.

NATO

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization turned 70 last month. Congressional leaders invited NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg to deliver an address before a joint meeting of Congress to mark the historic occasion.

The Secretary General began his speech with a vivid description of two monuments outside of the organization's headquarters in Belgium—one, a piece of the Berlin Wall and the other, a twisted steel beam from the north tower of the World Trade Center. Both serve a special purpose as powerful reminders for NATO members of where we have been and are going and our commitment to one another.

The United States and our transatlantic allies have seen the world change considerably during the seven decades of NATO's existence. The threat posed by the Soviet Union—one of the main reasons the alliance was formed—no longer exists, but the challenge of an increasing and hostile Russia has now taken its place.

Since Russia illegally annexed Crimea in 2014, Vladimir Putin has stepped up his acts of aggression by arming pro-Russia rebels in Ukraine, carrying out bombing campaigns on behalf of a murderous regime in Syria, and conducting cyber attacks on Western democracies.

Russia continues to seize land and expand its presence in Georgia, illegally occupying roughly 20 percent of Georgia's internationally recognized territory. On top of this, Russia has deployed mobile, nuclear-capable missiles in Europe. This clear violation of the INF Treaty will have long-term ramifications for NATO countries.

As the Secretary General stated in his joint session address, "an agreement that is only respected by one side will not keep us safe." We don't have to return to a Cold War era arms race as a result of Russia's actions. However, as Secretary General Stoltenberg noted, we must "prepare for a world without the INF Treaty and take the necessary steps to provide credible and effective deterrence."

While the threat posed by a resurgent Russia reinforces the need for a strong NATO, it is far from the only concern facing the alliance. China's expanding global influence and the aspirations of smaller rogue nations, like North Korea and Iran, will continue to challenge the West moving forward.

Additionally, while we have made great strides to eliminate ISIS on the battlefield, the threat posed by radical Islamic terrorists remains ever present and knows no boundaries.

The horrific Easter Sunday attacks in Sri Lanka have been linked to the terror group, proving that it clearly continues to export its tactics and recruitment well beyond Syria and Iraq.

There is no doubt that Western democracies remain squarely on ISIS's target list. In fact, the propaganda arm of ISIS just released a video of the group's leader, where he makes that threat abundantly clear.

Amid all of these challenges, NATO stands as a very visible deterrent. When half of the world's military stands together, bad actors take notice. Collectively, NATO members also make up half of the world's economic

might. The prosperity of NATO members makes the alliance that much stronger. With that prosperity, however, comes responsibility.

The strength of NATO is contingent on each other and every member paying its fair share. Every member nation must meet the agreed-upon defense spending levels. Secretary General Stoltenberg stressed this point during his address, and this message has begun to resonate with NATO members. An additional \$41 billion has been spent on defense by our European allies and Canada in the last 2 years alone. That number is expected to reach \$100 billion—\$100 billion—by the end of the year.

President Trump deserves credit for bringing about this sea change. His words to allies not living up to their commitments were conveyed in a very direct manner. NATO must be a fair alliance. The President's tough-love message has worked. The majority of our NATO allies have pledged to meet their financial obligations by 2024. The United States has been and must continue to be a strong example in this regard.

This is an important point to remember as we fulfill our funding obligations for fiscal year 2020. We must build on the progress we have made in recent years to end the chronic uncertainty that has negatively impacted our military readiness for far too long.

The Trump administration and Congress's shared commitment to our national security has helped to renew America's strength and given a blueprint to our NATO allies for how they, too, can help achieve their share of our common defense.

Congress has ushered through the largest investment in our national defense since the Reagan administration, and President Trump has initiated the modernization of our nuclear arsenal and a national strategy for missile defense. These were not easy lifts, but the United States has made them all happen. Our allies can as well.

We have accomplished a great deal together in the past, but many challenges remain for NATO in the future. As we mark the 70th year of the alliance, we do so with the knowledge that our friends from across the Atlantic will continue to be trusted partners who stand by each other in our hours of need.

With that, I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Maryland.

MR. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I thank my colleague for his comments in support of NATO and the alliance, one that we share on a bipartisan basis here in the Senate.

#### REMEMBERING RICHARD LUGAR

Madam President, I wish to take a few moments to honor former Senator Richard Lugar, who passed away on April 28.

Richard Lugar's leadership as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was a model of statesman-

ship—someone who put country over party and principle over politics.

I did not have the privilege of serving as a Senator with Richard Lugar, but I did have an opportunity to see him in action when I served as a Senate staff member, working on national security issues for another great Senator and statesman, Senator Mac Mathias, who also served on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

During that time, I witnessed Richard Lugar's work on a bipartisan basis to achieve major foreign policy successes. He had the vision to remain true to American values, and in a complex world, he took the long view of what was best for our country. Those traits produced the landmark law to reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation, known as the Nunn-Lugar Act, after its chief authors. The program has led to the elimination of more than 10,000 nuclear warheads, more than 1,000 ICBMs, and almost 40,000 tons of chemical agents that had been scattered across the former Soviet Union.

I was especially inspired by Senator Lugar's work to end the racist apartheid regime in South Africa. At the time, the Reagan administration was pursuing a policy of so-called "constructive engagement" with that apartheid regime. The Reagan administration was opposed to imposing sanctions on South Africa to help free Nelson Mandela, who was imprisoned, and to bring about an end to apartheid rule. Senator Lugar understood that continued engagement with that regime undermined America's values and our interests. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he led the efforts to pass the legislation to impose sanctions on South Africa, and when President Reagan vetoed that bill, Senator Lugar lead the bipartisan effort to overturn the veto of the President of his own party. That override was successful. Richard Lugar spurned partisanship in order to do the right thing for America.

S.J. RES. 7

Madam President, that brings us to the vote we will have today—whether or not to override President Trump's veto of the bipartisan legislation to end U.S. support for Saudi Arabia's brutal actions in the catastrophic war in Yemen.

I see Senator MURPHY, a colleague from Connecticut, on the floor. I thank him for his leadership in this area.

I urge the Senate to stand up together for American values and for our long-term interests and to vote today to overturn President Trump's veto.

Whether it is Saudi Arabia's conduct in the war in Yemen, their grizzly murder of American resident and Washington Post columnist Jamal Khashoggi, their imprisonment of U.S. citizens, or their gross violations of basic human rights, the United States must reevaluate and reshape our relationship with Saudi Arabia.

Let's look at Yemen. The Crown Prince has recklessly directed a brutal

war in Yemen for 5 years. That war has resulted in the world's largest humanitarian catastrophe. More than 100,000 civilians have been killed, and millions more are on the brink of starvation. More than 100 children die every day from extreme hunger there.

In fact, the United Nations has called the war in Yemen one of the "greatest preventable disasters facing humanity." Even after waging this brutal war, the result has been that the Iranian-backed Houthis are more entrenched and more militarily sophisticated today than they were at the start of this catastrophe, and Iranian influence in the region has expanded.

In short, the Crown Prince's and Saudi Arabia's military adventurism has been a major strategic blunder. So rather than vetoing the bipartisan legislation from Congress, the President's administration should be working overtime to help resolve the conflict and bring a negotiated end to that catastrophe.

I mentioned the vile and brutal murder of Jamal Khashoggi, who was a U.S. resident and a Washington Post columnist. Yet President Trump threw his own intelligence community under the bus when it came to the question of whether the Crown Prince had been complicit in the murder of Khashoggi in the Saudi consulate in Istanbul. It was the assessment of CIA Director Gina Haspel and others who said that the Crown Prince had been complicit in that murder. Yet President Trump said: "Maybe he did and maybe he didn't," and dismissed the whole thing. When the United States dismisses a CIA determination that the Crown Prince is responsible for the brutal killing and murder of an American resident, and we do nothing, that sends an awful signal around the world that puts Americans everywhere in danger.

Then, of course, we have seen just recently the terrible crackdown with respect to human rights violations in Saudi Arabia. In fact, just a week ago, Saudi Arabia beheaded 37 citizens, most of them minority Shiites, in mass executions across the country for alleged terrorism-related crimes, which Amnesty International pointed out were nothing more than sham trials that relied on confessions extracted through torture. Among those put to death was a young man convicted for reportedly attending a pro-democracy rally during the Arab Spring when he was just a teenager.

I have here a headline report: "Young Man Set to Attend Western Michigan University was Beheaded in Saudi Arabia." This was a man who was a teenager, was part of a democracy movement, and was imprisoned by the Saudi authorities. He had been intending to attend one of our American universities, and yet he was beheaded. You also find that the Saudis are detaining a number of American citizens, dual nationals, for their activism on human rights. They were seeking greater freedom for women in Saudi Arabia.

So rather than holding the Saudi regime accountable, this administration instead seems determined to move forward, in a very secret way, with providing nuclear assistance to the Saudi Government. They have talked about providing the authority for U.S. companies to engage in these conversations, even though Saudi leaders have openly talked about acquiring nuclear weapons and have raised the possibility of dumping spent nuclear fuel from their reactors on the border of neighboring countries.

Instead of helping the Saudis with their nuclear program and instead of vetoing bipartisan legislation to hold the Saudi Government and the Crown Prince accountable, the President should be actually reaching out on behalf of American interests, but he chose not to. He vetoed the bill. It is now our duty, in a bipartisan way, to stand up for American values and American interests, and I urge this Senate to vote to override the veto of President Trump.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, let me thank my colleague from Maryland for outlining one of the cases for why the override of the President's veto is so important.

There is no question that Saudi Arabia has in no way moderated their human rights behavior since the brutal murder of Jamal Khashoggi. In fact, as Senator VAN HOLLEN has rightly pointed out, the stick in America's eye from Riyadh has just gotten sharper. The number of executions has increased. More American citizens are being detained. I didn't catch it as to whether Senator VAN HOLLEN specifically referenced the case of Dr. Fitaihi, a Harvard-trained physician who has allegedly been tortured, including stripped to his underwear and shocked with electricity. He has been in detention without charges or a trial for 1½ years after his arrest.

The Saudis' behavior has gotten more outrageous, has crossed more human rights lines, has compromised the safety of more American citizens, and yet no response from the U.S. Congress and not a single piece of legislation moving through the U.S. Senate that would hold the Saudis accountable for the murder of Jamal Khashoggi and now the detention of multiple U.S. residents. We almost shut down our relationship with Turkey over the detention of an American pastor, but there is no similar response from this body when it comes to the continued detention of Americans in Saudi Arabia, with no trial, with no charges, and with evidence of torture. How is that? How is that?

Today we specifically litigate the case of the disastrous war that continues to rage inside Yemen today. I want to read a very short excerpt written by a hardened U.S. diplomat. Jeffrey Feltman is not a Democrat or Republican. He was a career Foreign

Service officer. He did some of the toughest duty in the Middle East, including a stint as our Ambassador to Lebanon. Many people know him, and I know he commands just as much respect from Republicans as he does from Democrats. Here is what he wrote. He said:

The war in Yemen has been a disaster for U.S. interests, for Saudi interests, and above all for the Yemeni people. It has sparked the world's largest humanitarian catastrophe: tens of thousands of civilians have been killed, and 14 million are at risk of starvation. It has been a strategic blunder as well, producing the exact results the Saudi-led military campaign was designed to prevent. The Houthis are more militarily sophisticated and better able to strike beyond Yemen's borders than they were at the start of the war; Iranian influence has expanded; and the relationship between the Houthis and Lebanon's Hezbollah has only deepened. Although the United Arab Emirates has waged an effective battle against al Qaeda in Yemen, terrorism remains a grave threat.

Now, I could read you similar pronouncements from all sorts of other Middle Eastern experts. There is a hegemony of opinion that this war has been a disaster not just from a humanitarian standpoint.

I had to select a picture that, frankly, wouldn't induce sickness from my colleagues. I chose a picture in which this young, starving boy's back is turned to the camera, but there are plenty others in which you would have a hard time holding down your lunch.

It is not just the humanitarian nightmare; it is the strategic nightmare that is Yemen. Every single day that we stay involved in this war, the battle lines do not change, and yet Iran and Hezbollah get more and more involved inside the military fight.

There is a political deal to be had here. If the United States chose to lead diplomatically instead of follow militarily, there is a political deal that can be had, but for reasons I do not understand, the United States does not lead the diplomatic negotiations. We outsource that to the U.N. I am a big fan of the U.N., but there is not going to be a peace settlement in Yemen without the United States as the lead. Instead, we simply choose to follow the military campaign of the Saudis by helping them engage in a bombing campaign that has murdered thousands of civilians, either on purpose or by accident. It has destroyed the civilian infrastructure of the country, and it does not relent.

Every single time you meet with somebody from the administration, they tell you: Well, it is getting better. It is getting better. There is really no evidence of that. On March 26, air-strikes reportedly hit a hospital supported by Save the Children in northwest Yemen, killing at least seven, including four children. There is no excuse for that because every single hospital is on the list of targets that the Saudis can't hit, and yet they continue to do so.

Senator ROMNEY and I just came back from the region, and here is what

we heard. All of the relief agencies that do the big heavy lifting in Yemen flew into Amman, Jordan, to talk to our delegation. I thought it was exceptional that they were making this trip, but then when they delivered the news that they had, I understood why they were making the trip into Jordan to meet with us. The report they gave us was absolutely bone-chilling.

I want you to listen to this. Today, in Yemen, there are 250,000 Yemenis who are so malnourished and so sick that they are beyond saving. They will die. One-quarter million Yemenis are so sick, are so malnourished that they cannot be saved, and another 10 million are on the cusp of entering that category. The only way to stop this humanitarian disaster, of a scope and scale that we see nowhere else in the world, is to end this civil war.

So long as the United States participates in the military campaign with the Saudis, while not offering any meaningful pressure to get to a political settlement, we are complicit in those deaths. One-quarter million people are going to die in the next several months inside Yemen from starvation and disease and malnutrition due to a military campaign that we are a part of. Don't get me wrong. The Houthis bear a great degree of responsibility for those who are starving inside territories they control. There is still 15 to 20 percent of the relief supplies that the Houthis steal and take for themselves, but hundreds of thousands of those who are dying or who are subject to disease and famine are in the parts of the country that are controlled by our coalition. This isn't just a matter of the Houthis refusing to let supplies get to people who need them. There are people dying in parts of the country that the coalition, of which the United States is a part of, controls, and we are standing by, largely idly, as this devastation continues.

I hope my colleagues will consider voting to overturn the President's veto. I hope you will do it because it is the only means by which we force a political settlement. I hope you will do it because even if you don't think that a political settlement is coming, the United States should never willingly be a part of a bombing campaign that results in this kind of starvation. I hope you will also do it because even if you believe Iran is the No. 1 objective of U.S. interest in the region or even if you believe that al-Qaida and ISIS are the No. 1 target of U.S. interest in the region, they are getting stronger every single day that the status quo continues.

The military campaign has been a massive failure. The battle lines don't move, and al-Qaida and ISIS remain uniquely strong inside that country because of the chaos, and Iran, every single day, becomes more and more influential. Get out of the military campaign, take the lead on the diplomatic effort rather than simply follow others, and we will end that misery. It is within our power to send that message.

I agree with Senator VAN HOLLEN. This is also about sending a message to Saudi Arabia about the continued murder and detainment of American citizens and residents. This is about standing up for human rights in the face of 37 people convicted and beheaded inside Saudi Arabia, several of them minors. But this is also about squaring U.S. policy with national security interests and getting the blood off our hands as 250,000 Yemenis face certain death if we don't do something different very soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I really want to thank Senator MURPHY for his longstanding commitment to this humanitarian need. We are now just a Senate vote away from making a major difference in regard to the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, and every Member of the Senate will now be on record.

I want Senator MURPHY to know that his work has been extremely important and is well understood. What he is saying I just really want to underscore; that is, the U.S. military engagement with Saudi Arabia and its partners is counterproductive, not just to the humanitarian crisis that exists today in Yemen but to America's national security interests.

The conflict in Yemen has become a humanitarian nightmare. At this point our involvement does not advance the interests of the United States, our partners, or regional stability.

I recognize that we have a strategic partnership with Saudi Arabia and that we have a mutual desire to prevent the expansion of Iranian influence and terrorist groups that seek to do us harm. However, our current military support to Saudi Arabia in the Yemen conflict has become detrimental to these shared goals and our broader partnership.

The suffering this conflict has caused is beyond measure. More than 22 million people, nearly 75 percent of the population, are at grave risk. The country has now seen the world's largest cholera outbreak, which has killed thousands. Hunger and malnutrition are threatening 2 million innocent children under the age of 5. A recent Save the Children report concluded that some 85,000 children have already died from starvation since the war began. Morally continuing our military involvement in this disaster simply should not be an option.

I would also like my colleagues to look beyond our direct support to the role U.S. arms sales play in worsening the conflict. These sales cannot come at the expense of human rights, mass atrocities, and regional destabilization. Saudi Arabia has shown a disregard for international law by inflicting devastating losses on civilians, including young children.

It is now well known that the Saudi-led coalition targets civilian infrastructure vital to Yemen's recovery

and reconstruction. In fact, a recent U.N. report concluded that the coalition's air campaign is the leading cause of civilian casualties in Yemen, with 61 percent due to coalition air strikes. Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and Bellingcat have found that U.S. weapons have been used in these unlawful air strikes. There is evidence that the coalition has used banned and inherently indiscriminate weapons like white phosphorus and cluster bombs.

The military conflict has produced staggering human rights abuses. The AP, international organizations, and a special expert group established by the U.N. Human Rights Council have found that all parties in the conflict have committed grave violations of human rights and the laws of war. Houthi war crimes and abuses are staggering; however, reports indicate our supposed partners have also engaged in horrific abuses, including widespread torture and sexual abuse at coalition-run secret prisons.

For all of these reasons, it is imperative that there is a speedy and peaceful conclusion to the conflict in Yemen. It is apparent that this will not come from our military involvement. We must, instead, focus our efforts on supporting U.N.-led efforts to foster dialogue, a ceasefire, and humanitarian access.

It is critical to prevent expansion of the Iranian influence and extremist groups in the region, but our military involvement is not helping us in that regard. Experts from across the ideological spectrum agree that the escalation of the conflict has increased Iran's and extremist groups' influence in Yemen. Our military campaign is counterproductive to our objective to minimize the influence—and hopefully eliminate the influence—of Iran and extremist groups.

With all of these considerations in mind, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate and House of Representatives came together to pass S.J. Res. 7. For reasons that are still incomprehensible to me, the President chose to veto this resolution. Oxfam recently responded to this by stating that "the people of Yemen and the parties to the conflict are watching closely and the messages US leaders send have the power to save lives."

With a veto, they lose faith in the United States and see the end to their suffering a little further out of reach. It is not, however, too late for Congress to do the right thing. By overriding this veto we assert this body's authority to support peace and human rights while making America safer and more secure.

I yield the floor.

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. LEE. Madam 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. Madam President, over the past few months, the Members of this body and the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives resoundingly have voted in favor of S.J. Res. 7, which would remove U.S. Armed Forces from Saudi Arabia's war in Yemen. This unconstitutional, unjustified, and ultimately immoral war has repeatedly come up over the last year, and thankfully America's elected lawmakers in Washington have taken a stand against it.

The President has vetoed our resolution, but today we have the opportunity—and I believe we have the absolute constitutional duty—to once again take a stand on this important matter. Today, we have the opportunity to override the veto in pursuit of justice, prudence, and upholding the constitutionally mandated separation of powers. This is one of the most important, fundamental features of our constitutional system. Congress and Congress alone may declare war. This is in direct contrast to the way our old national government—the one in London—worked. Under that system, the chief executive could take the country to war, but not in America, not under our system, not in the U.S. Constitution. In fact, it is one of the distinguishing characteristics pointed out in Federalist 69.

As we have already heard, the humanitarian crisis in Yemen is dire, and estimates show that the crisis is even worse than we had previously thought. The Yemen war has claimed the lives of tens of thousands of people, including a whole lot of innocent civilians in attacks that can only be described as horrific. It is believed that from 2016 to 2018, over 60,000 combatants and civilians were killed in direct violence attached to this war, but the full scale of suffering from starvation, poverty, and disease is even more staggering than the stark numbers that I have just quoted involving direct combat or direct violence.

Over half of the population of Yemen is considered currently to be in the crisis stage of famine. An estimated 3.3 million children are malnourished, and over 84,000 children have died just between the start of the war in 2015 and October of 2018. Poor water and sanitation conditions have also led to the largest cholera outbreak in history, with more than 1.3 million suspected cases and over 2,600 related deaths since the April 2017 outbreak.

Contrary to the claims of some of our critics, the United States has, in fact, been aiding and abetting the horrors of this war. Indeed, these critics claim that we have somehow not been involved in a war in Yemen. But in March of 2015, shortly after Saudi Arabia launched its war against the Houthi rebels, the Obama administration authorized U.S. military forces to provide "logistical and intelligence support" to the Saudi coalition. The

Obama administration provided this authorization without any kind of approval from Congress. Since then, we have helped the Saudis with surveillance, reconnaissance and information, target selection assistance, and, until quite recently, with midair refueling, including midair refueling involving combat missions. In other words, we have been materially assisting a foreign power in its efforts to bomb its adversaries and sometimes helping that foreign power to bomb innocent civilians on the ground in the process. Other opponents of our resolution claim that our involvement in this undeclared, unconstitutional, immoral civil war half a world away in Yemen is somehow constitutional, is somehow statutorily authorized under the War Powers Act of 1973, which authorizes the executive branch to use Armed Forces in cases of emergencies and under certain limited time constraints.

The conflict in Yemen—a conflict between a regional rebel group on the one hand and the Saudi-backed government on the other hand—by no means constitutes or in any way presents a threat to the safety of American citizens in the United States, and our involvement has far surpassed the allotment of any emergency time constraint contemplated under the war powers resolution. Still others say that we are not engaged in “hostilities” that constitute a conflict of war under the War Powers Act. But these critics, of course, are relying on an overly narrow and outdated definition from a 1976 memorandum—a memorandum, I would add, internal to the executive branch. In that respect, it is self-serving and one that does not include the indisputably high-tech activities of war today.

The way we fight wars today often ends up involving cyber activity, reconnaissance, surveillance, and target selection—the precise activities we are engaged in in this war in Yemen. Even aside from that, under the War Powers Act, we ourselves do not have to be involved in hostilities. We don’t have to establish that in order to trigger the War Powers Act—that we are involved in hostilities. The War Powers Act is triggered so long as we are sufficiently involved with the armed forces of another nation, when they—those armed forces of another nation—are themselves involved in hostilities. There can be no doubt in our minds—not in my mind, in your mind, not in the mind of any American—that the Saudis are engaged in hostilities in Yemen, and we are helping them. So it is immaterial; it is completely inconsequential if you accept this crab, self-serving, narrow, outdated definition of the word “hostilities” found in this 1976 Department of Defense memorandum.

Finally, some opponents of this effort, of this resolution to call for our withdrawal from this undeclared, unconstitutional, immoral war in Yemen, are saying that removing U.S. forces would somehow hurt our efforts to

combat terrorism in the region, specifically against al-Qaeda and ISIS, and would endanger the lives of American citizens and soldiers. In the first place, these critics are dangerously conflating different geopolitical conflicts. The conflict in Yemen is a regional, civil war. It is not about al-Qaeda. It is not about ISIS. Even if it were, our resolution, S.J. Res. 7, the one we are talking about today in the context of a veto override debate—that resolution explicitly states that it would not impede the military’s ability to fight these terror groups. Furthermore, there is evidence that our involvement in Yemen might well have—in fact, probably has—further destabilized the region and that it has actually undermined the effort against al-Qaeda’s affiliates. A 2016 State Department report found that the conflict between the Saudi-led forces and the Houthi insurgents has actually helped al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, also known as AQAP, and ISIS’s Yemen branch to “deepen their inroads across much of the country.”

So, no, involvement in Yemen is far from being in the best interest of the United States—not in the slightest, not even by a shred. Every day it only becomes clearer and clearer that Saudi Arabia is not an ally that deserves our unwavering, unflinching, unquestioning support and military intervention, especially when our own security—the security of the American people on U.S. soil—is not on the line.

Last October, there was of course the killing of Jamal Khashoggi. In February, a report came out suggesting that the United Arab Emirates have actually transferred American-made weapons to al-Qaeda-linked fighters and other military groups. In other words, the Saudi-led coalition is possibly giving our own weapons, in violation of our own end user agreements with them, to the very terrorist groups we are trying to fight, the very terrorist groups that opponents of this resolution incorrectly suggest would benefit from the passage of this resolution.

Just this past week, news surfaced that the Saudis ruthlessly beheaded 37 men who were mainly minority Shia Muslims, 5 of them gay men who were suspected to have been tortured into a confession. Perhaps we ought not be supporting that regime at all. Perhaps we ought not give unflinching, unwavering, unquestioning devotion to a regime that treats its own people that way and that has harmed others in its own region in the way that it has. At a bare minimum, we should not be fighting an unjust civil war on their behalf, half a world away, without congressional authorization.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution unequivocally states that Congress shall have the power to declare war—Congress, not the President, not the Pentagon, not someone else in the executive branch, not some expert anywhere in the executive branch of gov-

ernment, but Congress. They did so. They made it this way because they understood that the decision about whether to go to war is a decision fraught with immense moral peril. There is nothing pretty about war. It always, when we face such a decision, involves a decision to put American treasure and American blood on the line. Even if you think that with modern-day weaponry and/or the modern way in which we fight wars—if you think that American blood and treasure is not being put on the line, that simply isn’t true. That is exactly why the Founding Fathers placed this power in the legislative branch where it can be exercised squarely in front of the American people by their elected Representatives. This power was always intended to be exercised only by the branch of government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals because of the moral peril necessarily involved in any decision to go to war—moral peril involving the use of U.S. resources, the putting on the line of American blood, and also the moral peril that it creates wherever we are going to war.

If you truly believe that our involvement in Yemen is crucial to the safety of American citizens and America’s best interests generally, that is all the more reason to debate it and discuss it right here, right now. In fact, the Constitution demands it. It already is the law. We have to do this. If you are so confident that we should be involved in this war, let’s debate it. Let’s vote on it. Let’s let the American people see what we are about. Let’s let the American people have some say in the extent to which we put America’s good name, its treasure, and its blood on the line.

Today, we still have an opportunity to have a say, to take a stand over this most grave matter. I urge my colleagues to take it.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, let me thank Senator LEE and Senator CHRIS MURPHY for their outstanding and consistent leadership on this issue. At a time when the country bemoans the fact that there is not a lot of bipartisanship, this effort indicates that people with very different political philosophies can come together on an issue of enormous magnitude. I do want to thank MIKE LEE for his great work on this.

I rise today to speak in support of overriding the President’s veto of S.J. Res. 7. On April 16, despite telling us that he is opposed to “endless wars,” President Trump used the second veto of his Presidency to reject S.J. Res. 7, which directs the removal of U.S. Armed Forces from the Saudi-led intervention in the Republic of Yemen, a war that began 4 years ago. The vote on that resolution that was passed here in the Senate was 54 to 46—all Democrats voting for it and 7 Republicans

voting for it. The resolution passed the House on April 4 by a bipartisan vote of 247 to 175.

The current situation in Yemen is the worst humanitarian disaster on Earth. In March of 2015, under the leadership of Muhammad bin Salman—then Saudi Arabian Defense Minister and now the Crown Prince—a Saudi-led intervention in Yemen's ongoing civil war took place.

According to the United Nations, Yemen is at risk of the most severe famine in more than 100 years, with some 14 million people—this is a small, poor country—some 14 million people now face starvation as a result of this war, this Saudi-led intervention we are supporting.

According to the Save the Children organization, some 85,000 children have already starved to death, and millions more face death if the war continues.

It gets much worse than that. A new United Nations-commissioned report, just published by the University of Denver, states that the impact of this war on civilians—particularly children—is actually far more serious than previously thought. If this war continues, the report estimates that by the end of 2019, it will have taken the lives of some 219,000 people in Yemen, including 140,000 children under the age of 5. According to this report, every 12 minutes, a Yemeni child is dying as a result of this war.

The magnitude of the suffering in that country is literally unimaginable. We are talking about the possibility of millions of people starving to death and of hundreds of thousands of people dying by the end of this year.

The fact is that the United States, with relatively little media attention, has been Saudi Arabia's partner in this horrific war. We have been providing the bombs the Saudi-led coalition is using. We have been refueling their planes before they drop those bombs. We have been assisting with intelligence. In many cases, our weapons are being used to kill women and children.

Late last year, I met with several brave Yemeni human rights activists. They had come to urge Congress to put a stop to this war, and they told me clearly that when Yemenis see "Made in the U.S.A." on the bombs that are killing them, it tells them that the U.S.A. is responsible for this war, and that is a sad and tragic 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.

Issue No. 1 is the horrific tragedy we are contributing to in Yemen.

Issue No. 2 is equally important, and that is that the involvement of the United States in this war is clearly unconstitutional.

I hear many of my Republican friends claim they are strict constitutionalists. If you are a strict constitutionalist, voting to override Trump's

veto should be a no-brainer because this war has not been authorized by Congress. It is unconstitutional.

Let me remind my colleagues who may have forgotten what is in the U.S. Constitution. Article I, section 8 states clearly that "Congress shall have power to . . . declare war." While the President has the authority over the conduct of war once it has been declared, the Founding Fathers gave the power to authorize military conflicts to Congress—the branch most accountable to the people. Under the War Powers Act of 1973, the assignment of a member of the U.S. Armed Forces to "command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany" another country's military during a war constitutes the introduction of the United States into a conflict. Our military involvement in the war in Yemen, which has included logistical and intelligence support, as well as aerial refueling of Saudi war planes, clearly meets this definition.

For far too long, the Congress, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has abdicated its constitutional role with regard to the authorization of war. The historic passage of this resolution—the first time since the 1973 War Powers Resolution was passed that it has been successfully used to withdraw the United States from an unauthorized war—was a long-overdue step by Congress to reassert its constitutional authority.

Finally, after years of abdicating that responsibility, Congress stood up, in the Senate and in the House, and said: Mr. President, you do not have the power to get U.S. troops involved in a war that we did not vote upon. And that is a big deal. Congress is finally doing what the Constitution of the United States mandates that it do. Within a half hour or so, the Senate must act to protect that constitutional responsibility by overriding the President's veto.

I respect that there are Members of this body who voted against the initial resolution and that you support U.S. intervention in Yemen for one of a number of reasons, and I respect your point of view, but if you think the United States should be involved in the Saudi-led war in Yemen, bring that resolution to the floor of the Senate. Let's have that debate. You explain to the American people why we should be spending significant amounts of money and putting American military lives in danger and why you think it is a good idea. Come to the floor—that is what the Constitution says you should do—and let us vote that issue up or down. Maybe you win. Maybe you won't win. I think you won't win, but maybe you will. But let's have that debate. What is absolutely clear is that is the responsibility of the Senate and the House, and the President alone cannot decide when he wants to send American troops into conflict.

The last point I want to make is that this vote this afternoon must make

clear to Saudi Arabia that we will not continue to follow their lead into disastrous military interventions. Let us be very clear. Saudi Arabia is a despotic dictatorship that works overtime to prevent any movement in that country toward democracy. That is a country run by an incredibly wealthy family. I think Muhammad bin Salman has the distinction of owning both the largest yacht and the largest house in the world. They have endless wealth, and now they are using their wealth and power in a dangerous and irresponsible military intervention.

Saudi Arabia is a nation that treats women not as second-class citizens but as third-class citizens. It is a nation that 7 months ago murdered a journalist in cold blood in its own consulate in Turkey and then dismembered his body. That was the signal to any dissident in Saudi Arabia that if you dare speak out against the royal family, that is what you have to look forward to—getting killed in cold blood and having your body dismembered. Dozens of people were recently executed in Saudi Arabia because of their opposition to government policy.

The word has to get out to the dictatorship in Saudi Arabia that, no, we will not be following their lead and their interventions in wars that are only causing horrific pain in that region.

In my view, what we should be doing in Yemen now is ending the bombing, supporting a diplomatic solution to the civil war there that finally brings peace to that region, providing immediate humanitarian aid, and helping the people, along with the international community, to rebuild their shattered economy, which is dysfunctional today.

This is an important vote. It is an important vote that says the people of Yemen need humanitarian aid, not more bombs. It is a vote that says the Senate believes in the Constitution of this country, which says that it is Congress, not the President, that determines whether and when we go to war. It is a vote that tells Saudi Arabia we will not follow their lead in irresponsible intervention.

I hope very much that the Members of this body summon up their courage and vote to override Trump's veto.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. 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. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to cast my vote in support of the resolution we will shortly be voting on, which sends an important message that this body, directly representing the

American people, wishes to end direct U.S. military support for the Saudi-led coalition's campaign in Yemen.

I am disappointed but not surprised that the President issued a veto, choosing to stand by a campaign of devastating consequences for the people of Yemen. Every time we have a vote on this resolution and every day, the numbers get worse, but let us be clear. These numbers are people: 3 million human beings have been forced to flee, more than 15 million are on the brink of starvation, and more than 1 million individuals—children, mothers, fathers—are suffering from the largest cholera epidemic in the world.

Even the coalition countries themselves insist there is no military solution to this manmade conflict. As Houthi, backed with destabilizing and increasing support from Iran, continue to launch attacks into civilian population centers, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates continue their campaign which has targeted hospitals and threatened humanitarian access.

The fragile U.N.-brokered political process that emerged from Stockholm is almost at a breaking point. To be sure, the Houthis slow-walking the implementation of this plan presents a serious challenge, but U.S. focus should now be on supporting a meaningful, inclusive, and comprehensive process, even if it is one step at a time—a process that must start by ensuring that vital humanitarian relief reaches those who need it most desperately.

As some of my colleagues and the President have repeated, we do indeed have important security and military partnerships with the countries comprising the coalition, but these partnerships are not a blank check for weapons and direct support for a campaign that is decidedly working against U.S. interests in the region.

In addition to the truly horrific attacks on civilians, we have credible, alarming reports that our partners are transferring U.S. weapons to nonstate actors who have worked directly against the United States. Moreover, the length and brutality of this campaign have allowed Iran to exploit a vacuum and increase its influence and presence in the gulf.

This resolution sends an important message, but much work remains to be done.

I have a bipartisan bill that would authorize serious policy regarding U.S. weapons sales, that would hold accountable those blocking humanitarian aid, and help set the stage for supporting a meaningful political process.

As I have said before, we should consider this resolution just as one step, but one that must be taken, one that the Congress has shown it supports.

While the President has made his decision clear, the Congress must continue to assert our independence and continue to act where he will not.

Finally, let me also repeat what I said this morning at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee business

meeting—the Executive has a responsibility to share with us critical information that is directly relevant to the work of the committee.

Last month, I discovered intelligence directly related to a topic that the administration had regularly briefed the committee about but completely omitted. Without going into the details, I called the administration to provide committee members with more information. I believe the full Senate should have this information, which is relevant to votes we have taken, and I will be asking the majority and minority leaders to convene an all-Senators briefing on this topic. I think they should know before they cast votes.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of overriding President Trump's veto of the Sanders-Murphy resolution.

The resolution would end U.S. involvement in the war in Yemen, which I believe is long overdue.

Saudi Arabia's conduct in the war in Yemen has been deplorable.

It has purposefully attacked civilian infrastructure, including electricity generation facilities, water sanitation plants and, medical facilities. They have employed cluster munitions in civilian areas and used disproportionate force to attack military targets. In one attack, the coalition killed more than 40 children on a school bus, claiming to this day that the bus was a legitimate military target.

While I am pleased that the United States is no longer refueling coalition aircraft, I support ending all U.S. assistance for the Saudi-led coalition before thousands more die. To date, more than 63,000 people have been killed as a direct result of the conflict. If the conflict continues, an estimated 22,000 more people will be killed this year. That is only direct combat deaths, which is highly misleading. The ongoing war, with U.S. support, has indirectly killed far more, with Yemen's children bearing the brunt of the suffering. Since 2014, more than 85,000 children have died of starvation. That is worth repeating: More than 85,000 children have starved to death in the last 4 years in Yemen.

By the end of 2019, the total number of people in Yemen who will die from a lack of food, health services, and infrastructure is expected to top 131,000. Sixty percent of those killed will be children under the age of 5. In fact, a child in Yemen will die every 12 minutes unless we end this war.

The Saudi coalition's purposeful destruction of Yemen's civilian infrastructure, targeting of medical facilities and withholding of aid has led to the world's worst humanitarian crisis: 14 million people require emergency food aid. A majority of Yemen's population does not have access to clean water, sanitation, or adequate public healthcare. Cholera and other diseases are rampant throughout Yemen as public services have collapsed. There have

been 1.2 million suspected cases of cholera, resulting in 2,500 fatalities from this entirely preventable disease. Nearly three-quarters of the population—almost 22 million people—need some form of humanitarian assistance.

Sadly, the actions of the Trump administration have worsened the humanitarian harm. Through the President's "Muslim ban," the administration has effectively trapped civilians in Yemen, sealing their fate.

The Trump administration has not accepted a single refugee from Yemen since October 2017. It has banned permanent immigration from Yemen, including immediate family members of U.S. citizens, and it has stopped issuing temporary visas. The Trump administration has even refused to redesignate Temporary Protected Status for Yemen, making more than a thousand protected Yemenis subject to deportation.

The United States can help end the suffering in Yemen by halting all assistance to the Saudi-led coalition. It could also accept Yemeni refugees, resume normal immigration and extend TPS to Yemenis currently in the United States. The Trump administration has callously decided to do nothing.

The Sanders-Murphy resolution would direct the President to end all U.S. support for the war in Yemen. Given the horrific consequences of the conflict, I strongly supported the resolution when it passed the Senate on March 13, 2019.

I am disappointed but not surprised by the President's veto of it. The President's apparent plan is to continue to support the Saudi coalition even though it is clear that there is no military solution to this conflict. That is unacceptable.

Unfortunately, the President's unconditional support for Saudi Arabia is not limited to its conduct in Yemen. Under the direction of Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, Saudi Arabia murdered, dismembered, and disposed of the remains of a U.S. resident, Jamal Khashoggi. To this day, the Saudi Government continues to blame "rogue agents" for this heinous murder. They are holding a secret trial for the so-called accused, refusing to cooperate with international investigations, and continuing to rely on the Trump administration to shield it from accountability.

Any nation that would murder a journalist inside its own diplomatic facility is no friend of the United States. Any leader who would direct another human being to be dismembered with a bone saw is not fit to lead.

Let's be clear: Mohammed bin Salman is responsible for Khashoggi's murder. He is not fit to lead the kingdom and must be held accountable for this crime.

Saudi Arabia has also arrested, tortured and prosecuted peaceful political activists, including women. It has kidnapped and forcefully repatriated

Saudi nationals, executed religious minorities, and even illegally detained U.S. citizens.

The vote before us today would send a clear message to Saudi Arabia that we do not support its heinous policy and actions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sending that message.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RISCH. 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. RISCH. Mr. President, today we begin to consider S.J. Res. 7, which is a joint resolution that directs—and I quote from the resolution—“removal of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities in Yemen.”

This is the second time, of course, that we have considered this. We passed it, the House passed it, and the President has vetoed it, and it is now in front of us, under our constitutional responsibilities, to consider whether the resolution becomes law, notwithstanding the President’s signature.

I am going to urge a “no” vote on this, that it does not become law, and we sustain the veto the President has made.

As I have stated before, the premise of this resolution is fundamentally flawed and I believe a mischaracterization of the actual facts on the ground today in Yemen.

I want to start basically by, once again, making it absolutely clear what is and, more importantly, what is not happening with respect to U.S. engagement in Yemen.

What isn’t happening is the injection of U.S. troops into active hostilities in the Yemen civil war. To put it simply, our troops are not cobelligerents in this conflict.

What we are doing, however, is providing limited noncombat support to the Saudi-led coalition, including intelligence sharing and practices that have been developed to minimize civilian casualties—I am sure a goal everybody in this body supports.

This support is very narrow in focus, it is advisory in nature, and helps defend the territorial integrity of Saudi Arabia and the UAE, which both face a very real threat from the Iranian-backed Houthis and from Iran itself. Our limited support is intended to prevent the conflict in Yemen from escalating.

Iran’s support for the Houthis, notably the transfer of missiles and other weaponry, threatens to undermine our partners’ territorial integrity, imperils key shipping routes, and puts U.S. interests at risk, including thousands of U.S. personnel and citizens currently within range of the Iranian-made missile systems under Houthi control.

This, of course, includes the airport in Saudi Arabia, which many Members of this body have used from time to time when they go to codels in Saudi Arabia.

Many of us have been, for a long time, proponents of resolving the war in Yemen, and it could be resolved if the Iran regime will simply turn their back and walk away. Unfortunately, that is not likely. When I say many of us have been longtime proponents, I would certainly include the Presiding Officer in that and commend him for his long and hard work in that regard. He has been dedicated to this for a long time and has been a leader on this, for which he is to be commended.

Like many of us here today, I am dissatisfied with the state of the U.S.-Saudi relationship. Indeed, while Saudi Arabia has long been a bulwark of our Middle East policy, there is a growing gap in U.S.-Saudi relations.

Frankly, aspects of Saudi Arabia’s behavior are cause for serious concern. We are taking a comprehensive look at our relationship with Saudi Arabia on the Foreign Relations Committee, and it is common knowledge that there are a number of pieces of legislation floating around here—some of which have been introduced and that are circulating—that address this issue. We are attempting to craft legislation that can garner support in the committee, address concerns on both sides of the aisle, and actually become law.

I look forward to examining our interests in a measured and responsible way that will put the relationship on the right trajectory. This is not an easy needle to thread. All of us have concerns, all of us have specific issues in that regard, and what is important is that we don’t just poke at this but that we actually develop legislation that is bipartisan and that can be signed by the President and will become law.

The debate today, however, is predicated on the notion that this resolution will punish the Saudis and stop the devastating humanitarian crisis in Yemen. It will do neither of those. In fact, the DOD has assessed that this legislation would have no impact on the limited support we are currently providing today.

That said, there can be no arguing that after years of conflict, Yemen is now in the grip of the world’s worst humanitarian crisis, and that is in spite of the fact that many Members of this body—including the Presiding Officer—have gone way past limits to attempt to try to do things that would help that humanitarian crisis.

Just the simple delivery of humanitarian matters such as food in the country have been frustrated by things that logically should be very easy but haven’t been. I know the Presiding Officer has been very active in that regard and has been successful in that regard, for which he should be commended. An estimated 24 million—80 percent—of the Yemeni population are

in need of assistance, and 15.9 million people—more than half of the country’s population—remains severely food insecure.

A solution to this conflict must be found. Make no mistake, many, indeed, most of us, are committed to doing everything in our power to restore peace in a country that has been ravished by years of proxy war and fractious infighting.

I believe it is axiomatic that lasting peace can only be achieved through a political settlement brokered by the U.N. The U.N.-led peace talks are our best bet for achieving peace in Yemen, and they appear to be at a critical juncture right now as we sit here today.

As this body considers ways to drive effective U.S. policy that helps end the war and relieves humanitarian suffering in Yemen, I would urge all parties to abide by the agreement reached last December in Stockholm and find a political solution to the conflict. We should remain committed to doing everything in our power to advance this cause.

Thank you.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill (S.J. Res. 7) pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are required under the Constitution.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted “nay.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Leg.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—45

Alexander	Burr	Crapo
Barrasso	Capito	Cruz
Blackburn	Cassidy	Enzi
Blunt	Cornyn	Ernst
Boozman	Cotton	Fischer
Braun	Cramer	Gardner

Graham	Lankford	Sasse
Grassley	McConnell	Scott (FL)
Hawley	McSally	Scott (SC)
Hoeven	Perdue	Shelby
Hyde-Smith	Portman	Sullivan
Inhofe	Risch	Thune
Isakson	Roberts	Tillis
Johnson	Romney	Toomey
Kennedy	Rounds	Wicker

## NOT VOTING—2

Bennet      Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 45.

Two-thirds of the Senators being duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution on reconsideration fails to pass over the President's veto.

The majority leader.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 116.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Bianco, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Joseph F. Bianco, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, John Boozman, Mitt Romney, Roy Blunt, Joni Ernst, Mike Braun, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 95.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2021.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2021.

Mitch McConnell, Lindsey Graham, Kevin Cramer, Mike Rounds, Roy Blunt, Richard Burr, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Tim Scott, Jerry Moran, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Lisa Murkowski, Roger F. Wicker, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 89.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Spencer Bachus III, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2023.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Spencer Bachus III, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2023.

Mitch McConnell, Lindsey Graham, Kevin Cramer, Mike Rounds, Roy Blunt, Richard Burr, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Tim Scott, Jerry Moran, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Lisa Murkowski, Roger F. Wicker, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 94.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Judith DelZoppo Pryor, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2021.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Judith DelZoppo Pryor, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2021.

Mitch McConnell, Lindsey Graham, Kevin Cramer, Mike Rounds, Roy Blunt, Richard Burr, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Tim Scott, Jerry Moran, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Lisa Murkowski, Roger F. Wicker, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 100.

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