

of Representatives to receive a message from His Majesty King Charles III.

Thereupon, the Senate, preceded by the Deputy Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, Jason Bell; the Secretary of the Senate, Jackie Barber; and the Vice President of the United States, JD VANCE, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by His Majesty King Charles III.

(The address delivered by His Majesty King Charles III to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

#### RECESS UNTIL 4 P.M.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled recess begin immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senate stands in recess until 4 p.m.

There being no objection, at the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate, at 12:16 p.m., recessed until 4 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BANKS).

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

##### WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak on a War Powers Resolution that will be called up for a vote in the 5 o'clock hour, I believe, and I expect a number of other colleagues might take the floor. This is a resolution that I filed together with Senators GALLEGRO and SCHIFF, and it is like other resolutions that I have filed in recent weeks to challenge the President's authority to take the United States to war without a vote of Congress.

In this instance, this resolution deals with the country of Cuba. The United States has had a long, long history with Cuba that I needn't recount here, but suffice it to say, as a member of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, I have never heard the suggestion that Cuba poses an imminent security threat to the United States, and I think it is an accepted fact that there is currently no war authorization passed by Congress that would authorize military actions against Cuba.

And so using the privileged provision of the War Powers Resolution, I have filed this, together with my colleagues, to say we should not be at war—we should not be engaged in hostilities with Cuba unless there is a congressional debate and vote.

My argument is that, under the terms of the resolution, we are already engaged in hostilities with Cuba because we are using American force—primarily the Coast Guard but other assets as well—to engage in a very devastating economic blockade of the nation. If anyone were doing to the

United States what we are doing to Cuba, we would definitely consider it an act of war.

Let me describe what United States actions with respect to Cuba now mean to Cuban citizens. The blockade which went into effect and is using United States assets to block energy from being delivered to the island—because it does not have its own energy sources—has led to severe humanitarian crises across Cuba. Between January and March, nearly 100,000 scheduled surgical procedures were not carried out in hospitals in the country due to power limitations—power limitations brought on by the fuel blockade. More than 11,000 of these procedures were procedures that had been scheduled for children.

Hospitals in Cuba are facing a particularly severe shortage of fuel since Cuban hospitals are run by the Cuban Government and President Trump has focused on curtailing shipments of energy destined for governmental use, and that governmental use includes hospitals and other healthcare providers. There has been significant press reporting about the humanitarian impact of this energy blockade upon the healthcare sector and medical shortages in Cuba.

In addition to the canceling of hospital procedures, the shortage of energy and particularly the blocking of energy to the Cuban Government has meant the cutoff of running water in many urban areas because the water supply systems in Cuba rely upon electric pumps. More than a third of the Cuban population does not currently have access to clean water. Eighty-seven percent of the national water system's pumps rely on grid electricity to function. Trash has piled up because of lack of gas to run garbage trucks, and doctors say preventable deaths are rising as equipment fails, including the refrigeration that is necessary to maintain certain medications at appropriately low temperatures.

In Cuba, daily power cuts in urban and rural areas have been lasting between 12 and 20 hours and, in some cases, exceeding 48 to 72 hours. Cuba has experienced multiple national blackouts in the months of March and April. Cuba is a nation that is very rural, and these cuts fall particularly heavily upon rural Cuba.

In late March, the United States Coast Guard did allow a single Russian oil tanker carrying about 730,000 barrels of oil to pass through the blockade, providing Cuba with a few weeks of fuel. But in a country where the average monthly wage is about \$15, gas is now nearly \$40 a gallon. If you can find it, you probably can't afford it.

The blockade of energy also affects food prices. They have risen more than 13 percent. Restrictions in rural electrical supply are projected to cause a 40-percent reduction in short-cycle crop yields—crops like vegetables, beans, and potatoes. Cold chain disruption has led to significant rates of spoilage for perishable foods.

These are the kinds of things that happen when the United States decides, for no reason other than a desire to change the Cuban regime, that we will impose an energy blockade upon them. And again, if another country was doing this to the United States and causing the cancellation of medical procedures, especially for kids; the blackouts; the shutting down of municipality water supplies; and other significant challenges in the United States, we would consider it a hostility and even an act of war.

It is interesting that there has not yet been a clear justification for what the United States is doing to Cuba other than a desire to change its regime. There is no argument that they have nuclear weapons or a ballistic missile program. There is no argument that they pose an imminent threat to the United States.

Now, could we stand here and debate at some length and find some significant bipartisan support for the notion that the Cuban regime is a gross violator of human rights? I think we could. It has been a source of sadness that as the United States took some steps toward normalization of Cuba, that did not lead the Cuban Government to necessarily open up human rights or freedoms for its population. So, sure, we could have a debate about what we thought about the Cuban regime, but a desire to change the regime of another nation is not a sufficient reason for the United States to threaten and carry out military action that is devastating to the population.

So given that regime change should not be a reason for war unless it is debated upon and embraced by Congress—and if we were going to say the regime change of a bad regime is a reason for the United States to go to war, we would have an awful lot of countries in the world where we would be debating about going to war. But given that there isn't an imminent threat to the United States from Cuba, I am glad to join with my colleagues and call up this War Powers Resolution.

We just heard a powerful speech from King Charles III. We took the break to walk down to the House to hear the speech, and it was a powerful one. And one of the lines in the speech that got a lot of applause on all sides of the aisle—and I even noticed members of the President's own Cabinet standing to applaud a line—was his assertion that part of the origin of the American Declaration of Independence and the American independence project was to form a government whereby the legislature would have the power, as the article I branch, to stand up against overreaches by an Executive.

An overreaching Executive, even in matters of war, is not something that is new to the United States. It is not something that is partisan. Executives of both parties, Whigs and Federalists, before there were Democrats and Republicans, often attempted to overreach. But what the Framers put into

the Constitution and that constitutional command as expressed in the statute that allows a Member of Congress to offer a war powers resolution is that when there are efforts by an Executive to go too far, then it is up to Congress to stand up and provide a check against any overreach.

Abraham Lincoln, as a Congressperson, wrote a letter to his law partner grappling with this very issue, and he said the Framers of the Constitution were very focused on reducing what he called “Kingly oppressions.” And he said the most Kingly of all oppressions is the tendency of Executives to distract or impoverish their populations by taking them to war. And so, for that reason, we vested the question of war with the legislature.

And so given that there are underway hostilities against Cuba that are causing significant humanitarian crises among children and others, innocent civilians in Cuba, and given that there has been no congressional authorization of these hostilities, I ask my colleagues to do what we were just urged to do by King Charles III and, in the best tradition of American Government, stand for the proposition that the legislature should provide a check against an overreaching Executive.

Please vote in the affirmative on my resolution that we should not be engaged in hostilities or war with Cuba absent a congressional debate and vote.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise to follow the comments of my colleague from the Commonwealth of Virginia, and I intend to join him in voting against any proceedings by the United States military, any action by our President to invade or occupy Cuba without authorization by the Senate, by the House, by the Congress of the United States.

We just heard an address by King Charles III, and it is striking that he made a few simple and clear points. He delivered his remarks with humor, with engagement, and with respect, but he could not have been clearer that the fight for freedom in the world today is principally engaged in Ukraine’s defense against Russian aggression. And he asked us to continue our support with our NATO allies for Ukraine’s brave fight and got a standing ovation.

He also reminded us of the very beginnings of liberty in the British Commonwealth when the Magna Carta was signed at Runnymede and spoke about the shared history of limitations on Executive power, on restrictions on overreach—first by a King; here, by a President.

The sad truth is that this body has gradually handed away the power to control war and peace to increasingly overly powerful Presidents.

I am grateful to my colleague from the Commonwealth of Virginia for his repeated efforts to bring to this floor

and to move forward clarifying amendments, important votes, to sunset an overused authorization for the use of military force that dated back 24, 25 years, and to insist that in the current actions against Venezuela, against Iran, and potentially soon against Cuba that this body do its job: Stand up and take a vote, be on the record.

Last, if I might, I am the senior Democrat on Defense Appropriations, and in repeated recent meetings with the highest levels of the leadership, civilian and military at the Pentagon, I have repeatedly raised concerns about the defense of Ukraine.

Last year, the Pentagon sent us a budget. The President sent us a budget that requested nothing—zero—to reinforce our NATO allies in the Baltic States and to support Ukraine.

Ukraine is, today, overwhelmingly funded by our NATO allies, by the Western European partners who have stepped forward and funded their acquisition of munitions in the United States and from across our partners and allies.

Last year, they requested zero, and this Congress, on a bipartisan basis, inserted \$400 million for the defense of Ukraine—\$400 million out of \$1.1 trillion last year.

Once again, this year we received a budget with zero for Ukraine, and I have made it clear to the administration and their representatives, the Secretary and others, that if they don’t demonstrate how they will spend the money appropriated by this body and signed into law by the President, they should not expect to receive one dime more.

So as the question of how we will conduct ourselves going forward in Cuba, in Ukraine, in the Middle East is before this body, I intend to continue to vote for the Congress to take its constitutional role and, more than anything, for us to not hand away the power of the purse to an overreaching President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the resolution offered by Senator KAINE and others to prohibit the unauthorized use of American Armed Forces in hostilities against Cuba.

Now, some may think this isn’t a necessary concern, but to quote the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief:

Cuba is next.

This is urgent, and it requires immediate attention by the U.S. Senate.

Cuba is a bankrupt country. It is the size of Tennessee. It has neither the capacity nor the intention to threaten the United States. And even before the Trump administration cut off oil from Venezuela and started illegally blocking oil shipments to Cuba from other countries, Cuba’s economy was barely functioning.

Today, electricity is unavailable for most hours of the day across the entire

island. Think of what that means for everyday life. It doesn’t take much imagination. Just think about what it is like in our own communities when there is a power outage for a period of time.

In Cuba, where it is sustained, it is catastrophic. Havana’s streets are filled with smoldering garbage. The country is facing economic collapse, literally, and the United States is complicit in that economic collapse.

So by causing Cuba’s economy to fall apart and leaving millions of Cubans without enough food or access to medical care, the White House hopes to create a national security “emergency” to justify regime change, including, if necessary, the use of military force.

And we have seen that script play out before with the Trump administration.

President Trump has said as much. He has repeatedly threatened to use force against Cuba. Without any legal justification, he said:

[I]t may be a friendly takeover, it may not be a friendly takeover. Wouldn’t really matter because they’re really are down to . . . fumes. They have no energy, they have no money.

The reason Cuba is “down to [the] fumes” is due to its own government, its failed policies. And because of the U.S. oil blockade, both, together, have led to this catastrophic situation.

But no American President, under any circumstances, “friendly” or “unfriendly,” should threaten to take over another sovereign nation. It is Congress’s responsibility to reject such a flagrant “might makes right” abuse of Executive power.

There is plenty of blame to go around for how we got to this point. Cuba’s leaders, whose priority is holding onto power, do systematically violate the rights of the Cuban people, and they align themselves—the Cuban leaders—with, ideologically, some of the world’s worst regimes.

Cuba’s centralized economy has practically ruined the country, despite its tropical climate and abundance of rich farmland.

For our part—we control our part—the United States has tried to overthrow the Cuban Government by armed invasion, by assassination, by financing Cuban dissidents, and imposing a web of punitive sanctions with extraterritorial reach.

So after 65 years of an embargo that has not achieved any of its goals but has exacerbated and tested the daily suffering of the Cuban people who are not our adversary, the United States and Cuba need to find a way to peacefully coexist.

A few weeks ago, I outlined what I thought such an agreement would look like. I won’t repeat that here, but at the very least, the President should, No. 1, remove Cuba from the list of state sponsors of terrorism, which has no legal or factual basis and which no other country agrees with.

And the President should pressure Congress to repeal the failed U.S. embargo so Cuba’s economic reconstruction can begin.

And Cuba's leaders—and they have enormous responsibility here—should abandon central planning of the economy. It has been an absolute disaster for the Cuban people. And the Cuban Government must release all political dissidents and accept the right of the Cuban people to express themselves freely and without fear of prosecution.

Political and economic change in Cuba is long overdue. Neither is sufficient by itself. The Cuban people—90 percent of whom were born after the 1959 revolution—they want leaders who accept the need for fundamental changes in how to govern with greater participation of the people, greater transparency, and greater freedom and real accountability.

Rather than threats of a “takeover,” the United States should negotiate a solution with Cuba that puts U.S. national interests and the needs and aspirations of the Cuban people first, not the interests of the Cuban Government or American billionaires.

I urge my colleagues to support Senator KAINE's resolution. The American people do not want to wake up in the morning to learn that we are at war with Cuba, and I urge the Trump administration and Cuba's leaders to take the steps I have outlined to finally put an end to the decades of hostility between us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, when I talk to people in Arizona, they tell me they want their politicians to focus on helping them afford healthcare, buy a home, put groceries on the table, and fill up the tank.

Not once has anyone said to me: You know what we need? Another war.

And yet, that is exactly what this administration keeps delivering, one conflict after another.

Right after New Year's, Trump illegally invaded Venezuela with no plan for democratic transition. Less than 2 months later, he led us into a war with Iran with no justification or definition of what victory looks like.

Now, 13 servicemembers are dead; we are deploying more troops overseas; and gas prices are up 40 percent as a direct result of Trump's failing foreign policy.

But as if the disaster of the Iran war and the resulting spike in oil prices weren't enough, Trump is continuing to threaten to invade Cuba as well. What we have seen in the past 5 months tells us we can't just ignore these threats.

Trump's go-fast-and-break-things approach doesn't work. When you rush into a war without a plan, people die. When you send servicemembers overseas with no clear justification, they come home broken. And we can't afford the consequences of that, not when it comes to American lives.

Trump has zero understanding of what it means to make life-and-death decisions because he has never served a

day in his life. It is not his or his friends' children he is sending to die; it is young working-class Americans.

I know. I served in Iraq with many of these men and women. Twenty-three of them did not make it back. Their lives, the lives of our servicemembers, are what Trump is playing with right now.

The American people are not asking for this. They want us to focus on building up our communities, not nation building abroad. They want us focused on building housing in Arizona, not bombing houses in Havana. They want us to lower the cost of healthcare and not condemn a generation of veterans to a lifetime of hospital visits. And they want us to make their lives more affordable, not spend their tax dollars on unnecessary wars.

But instead of focusing on what the American people want, President Trump has decided instead to focus on satisfying the neocons in his circle, like Marco Rubio, who are always asking for a new war and who see every crisis as an opportunity to score political points in South Florida.

Donald Trump, the man who ran on “America First” and ending forever wars has handed over the keys to the war hawks, and it is American families that are going to pay the price.

This resolution is very clear: No unauthorized war in Cuba, and no more bypassing Congress. If military force is necessary, then Trump and Rubio need to come to Congress and make their case in full view of the American public and let the country decide if it is really in America's best interests.

But the people I talk to in Arizona, the troops I have served with, and the families who have buried loved ones who didn't come back, they know the answer. They know what the final answer would be. It is: Do not do this. It is not in our interest, and it is not what America wants.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of this War Powers Resolution to make clear that the United States will not be dragged into yet another conflict, this time with Cuba—a conflict that would not serve American interests and does not have authorization from this U.S. Congress.

Americans are already paying the price for President Trump's illegal war against Iran—a war that has no end in sight, a war that is making us less safe and worse off. And, of course, before the war in Iran, we saw Trump's illegal act of war against Venezuela, where he put our troops in danger in order to grab Venezuela's oil for his billionaire buddies. The administration continues to carry out illegal, monthslong boat strikes in international waters, which have killed at least 185 people since September. Now President Trump has also floated the idea of using force against our allies, like his scheme to seize Greenland, which, of course, is part of Denmark, which is part of the

NATO alliance. And the list goes on and on and on.

Our Constitution is explicit: The power to declare war rests with Congress—with the Senate and with the House—not with the President of the United States. Yet we are once again confronted with a situation where Trump appears ready to tear up our Constitution—a Constitution when he was once asked whether he had to abide by, he said: I don't know. And we are seeing that mindset in action every day.

We have seen deeply alarming rhetoric and actions from the administration when it comes to Cuba. What began as economic warfare has now edged into open discussions of military intervention. President Trump himself has said:

Taking Cuba. I mean, whether I free it, take it. I think I can do anything I want with it.

But we all know that Cuba is not property to be acquired by Donald Trump, and military force is not supposed to be a tool for Presidential impulse or political theater. And no President—no President—has the legal authority to unilaterally send American troops into conflict starting a war. But Trump has shown again and again that he thinks he is above the law and above the Constitution.

Many of us just joined the King of England, King Charles, where he talked about the Magna Carta and checks and balances. This President of the United States thinks he is a King and thinks he is not bound by checks and balances. Any of our colleagues who aid and abet him are complicit in undermining the Constitution of the United States—one that he has shown disdain for time and again.

To understand why we are here, we need to look at the choices this administration and previous administrations have made and the consequences that have followed.

President Trump's current policy on Cuba is not a total aberration; it is him and Secretary Rubio doubling down and putting on steroids over 65 years of a failed, bankrupt policy.

Since 1960, Republicans and Democratic administrations alike have pursued a policy of isolation and economic pressure and strangulation toward Cuba. After 6½ decades, the promise of political change still has not been realized.

You would think that when you keep doing something and don't get the result you want, you would do something different. Instead, we see the Trump administration doubling down and putting their foot on the gas of failed policies.

I recall that under President Biden, the United States began to turn the tide. It began to take some positive steps. The Obama administration restored diplomatic relations, expanded travel, and made an effort to engage with Cuba in a way that had not been done in decades.

I had a chance to see this newfound diplomacy up close. My first trip to Cuba was to visit an American called Alan Gross. He was part of an international development contractor with USAID, and he was a constituent of mine in Maryland.

He was imprisoned by the Cuban Government for 5 years. I worked closely with the Obama administration to help secure his release and joined the bipartisan delegation that included Senator Leahy and Senator Flake at the time that ultimately brought Alan Gross home in 2014.

That breakthrough played a role in opening the door to a new chapter in U.S.-Cuban relations. At the time, we began to see some shoots of real progress and liberalization in the Cuban economy. The problems at hand were, of course, not solved overnight, but the light at the end of the tunnel was beginning to look bright, and it was clear that this new approach had real potential. But that chapter was short-lived, as President Trump in his first term reversed course, reimposing strict travel restrictions and tightening sanctions—back to the failed playbook of over 60 years.

A diplomatic relationship cannot be repaired overnight—especially with two countries with decades of fraught history like the United States and Cuba—and the Biden administration failed to take meaningful steps to get us back on the course that the Obama administration had taken us, which brings us to where we are today, with the Trump administration not only reverting to their first-term policies but doubling down on this hostile, ineffective, and proven failure of an approach.

The Trump administration has pursued an aggressive pressure campaign against Cuba: tightening restrictions, cutting off critical fuel supplies, and effectively imposing an oil blockade on the island—an oil blockade that is exhausting the country's supply of fuel, restricting both travel and daily life within the country while also crippling the Nation's healthcare system, resulting in preventable deaths. Here is a headline from the March 26 New York Times. It reads "Cuban Patients Are Dying Because of U.S. Blockade, Doctors Say."

The stated goal was to force political change in Havana, but months into the Trump administration's belligerent approach, it is clear they have not begun to achieve the intended result. Again, same old policy, no better results—in fact, worse. The Cuban authoritarian government remains fully in control. Instead, what we are seeing is the rapid deterioration of conditions for the people of Cuba.

Across the island, families are living through prolonged blackouts and an energy crisis that has crippled infrastructure across the island. Without sufficient fuel, hospitals cannot function properly, schools and businesses are forced to close, and families are left to navigate daily life without the most basic necessities.

The only change—the only change—that the United States has succeeded in forcing upon Cuba is a humanitarian crisis affecting millions of people, because of Trump and Rubio's reckless blockade that is punishing the Cuban people, not the Cuban regime.

We have seen this approach before. We have seen it for 60 years. We know how it ends. The longer we continue down this path, the more severe the consequences will become—not for those in power but for the millions of people caught in the middle.

That should force all of us to ask a critical question: What exactly is the Trump-Rubio strategy here?

We see they don't have a strategy in Iran, and they clearly don't have a strategy here, because if the goal is to support the Cuban people, then it is failing—failing, failing, failing—because what we are seeing is yet another policy built on the assumption that maximum pressure will produce quick political change. Instead, it has produced maximum citizen and civilian suffering with minimal results.

Now, instead of reconsidering this failed approach, the administration appears to be considering an even more dangerous step—that of military escalation. Of course we want democracy and fundamental freedoms for the people of Cuba, but we have seen over decades that economic strangulation does not work, and we have learned the hard way in Afghanistan and now Iran that bombs don't turn dictatorships into democracies. Yet here we are with reports that the administration is considering yet another war that is not in this country's interest.

Americans are asking for stability. They are asking for lower costs. The idea of launching another illegal, costly, regime-change war is completely out of step with what their hopes and aspirations are. Yet that is what this administration is pursuing even though Candidate Trump promised he would focus on bringing down prices and keeping us out of war.

The American people are already bearing significant costs of the war in Iran—lives lost, treasure expended, making us less safe—and all of this not authorized by this Congress. And now, instead of bringing that conflict to an end, this administration is signaling it may open the door to yet another one in Cuba.

We have to ask what gets crowded out when we have a President and a White House that are focused on getting Americans into war rather than on the economic well-being of the American people.

We have a responsibility here to the American people to represent them and to act in their interests. And decisions of war and peace, whether it is Iran or Cuba or anywhere else, must be made with the involvement of the representatives of the American people. That is not just my sentiment; that is what is in the Constitution of the United States.

So we have the opportunity today to get ahead of another bad decision by the Trump administration, another bad decision to drag us into an illegal war, and to do it now before that conflict begins instead of hoping we can end it once the fuse is lit. In fact, it is our duty—it is our duty—to uphold the Constitution and make clear that we will do our jobs here in the U.S. Senate.

So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to uphold our constitutional responsibilities and to vote in favor of this War Powers Resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, the measure we are talking about is completely out of touch with the facts in Cuba, nor is it relevant to anything actually happening in Cuba right now.

President Trump has never suggested we put troops on the ground in Cuba, so this entire effort is moot.

The only reason I can think a Democrat would propose this is for a fund-raising email showing how they are fighting President Trump tooth and nail.

I want to note that elected Democrats have turned up violent rhetoric against this President in the last several years, resulting in yet another radicalized leftwinger attempting to assassinate President Trump on Saturday night. And my Democrat colleagues still refuse to fund paychecks for the Secret Service agents who stopped the shooter or for the ICE and Border Patrol agents protecting Americans lives. But since Democrats refuse to fix that problem they created, let's talk about the resolution before us today.

I am from Florida. We probably have more Cuban Americans in Florida than any State in the country, and they have been unbelievably successful in our State. So I am really—I always love to talk about Cuba, and I am glad the Democrats want to talk about Cuba.

Since the 1959 socialist revolution, the authoritarian dictatorship has refused to hold free and fair elections in Cuba. So there are no elections in Cuba. There is no duly elected President in Cuba. The Castro regime has killed Americans and its citizens, and they cozy up to our enemies—Russia, communist China, Iran, and Hezbollah.

Democrats say they are the party of democracy, so where is their concern for the anti-democratic dictator operating 90 miles from the shore of Florida, 90 miles from the shore of the United States?

Many Democrats—some in this Chamber—are embracing socialism and even embracing a violent socialist leader, Hasan Piker, that wants me murdered. He says I should be murdered; capitalists should be murdered; 9/11—we deserved it; anti-Semitic; and he supports the regime in Cuba.

Some Democrats have even gone to Cuba with Piker, attempting to whitewash the atrocities of the illegitimate,

communist regime. Now, when they went there, did they go to the prisons to see any political prisoners? Did they ask about any political prisoners? Did they try to get one political prisoner released? Not one. One Democrat Congresswoman even said after her trip that "Cuba has a remarkable public health system." If you talk to political prisoners and you talk to their families, that is not exactly what they would tell you.

Some Democrats say they want socialism. Where has that succeeded? Nowhere. It results in misery and death for everyone but the regime leaders. Everyplace that has tried, it has always failed, and the only people that succeed are the regime leaders.

Right now—right now—for decades, Cuba has been unjustly imprisoning hundreds of political prisoners just for demanding elections and complaining that the regime is failing to provide electricity. There is a 6-year-old boy in prison right now because he complained his family didn't have electricity. Have I heard one of my Democratic colleagues say "Oh, that is wrong"?

When they say that under Obama, things were better, oh, did all the political prisoners get released? No.

There is a photo right here. What year do you think this was taken? Do you think it was taken during the Second World War at a concentration camp, a Holocaust survivor? Do you think it was maybe from a Soviet prison?

What year do you think, Mr. President? What is your guess as far as the year this was taken?

This was taken just a few miles from the Florida shore, probably less than 100 miles from our shore, just a few weeks ago.

This individual—his name is Alexander Diaz Rodriguez. If you look at the before-he-went-to-prison picture, he doesn't look 30 years old. But he is a political prisoner. He was tortured, starved, isolated. He was denied this unbelievable healthcare system in Cuba even though he has cancer—all because he opposed the socialist regime. Not one of my Democratic colleagues here, not one of my Democratic colleagues who went down to Cuba did one thing to get him out of prison.

This is the misery of the people of Cuba. This is the face of the misery of the people of Cuba.

The President of Cuba just had an interview with mainstream media. Did not ask one question about the political prisoners. Didn't ask any of these things.

A lot of people never want to look at these pictures, never want to post these. I am going to look at this, and I am going to talk about this as long as possible. We all should be thinking about, this is the face of the regime in Cuba, and when you go support the regime in Cuba, you are supporting what they are doing to an individual like Alexander.

Democrats in this Chamber will choose to oppose President Trump but not Cuba's illegitimate, communist dictator, Miguel Diaz-Canel.

The real reason we are discussing this is what one of my Democratic colleagues said. My Democratic colleague said he plans to keep introducing these resolutions just to criticize President Trump, waste our time and ask "Have you seen enough?" One of my Democratic colleagues even admitted that on national television.

But again, President Trump has never said that he wants to put boots on the ground. I don't think any of my Republican colleagues have said it. Even LINDSEY GRAHAM has not said it.

So this resolution is defending the regime that is oppressing people like Alexander Diaz Rodriguez.

I will ask my Democratic colleagues to take a look at this picture. Look at this picture, and think of what that regime is doing. This is what the Cuban regime is doing to the people right now.

So, to my Democrat colleagues, have you seen enough? Have you seen enough to say this has to stop?

President Trump is doing everything he can to bring back freedom and democracy all across Latin America, and we should do everything we can to support him. This President has never said he wants to put boots on the ground.

This is a complete waste of our time, and it is a complete insult to Cubans in Cuba and to Cubans in my State.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Senator from Virginia.

**DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES WITHIN OR AGAINST THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS—Motion to Discharge**

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I am about to make a motion with respect to the War Powers Resolution, but I understand there will be a point of order offered that is not debatable. So I just want to say that my understanding is that the point of order will suggest that what is currently being engaged in, in Cuba, is not hostilities.

The War Powers Resolution clearly contemplates a resolution being within the contemplation of the body of hostilities that are ongoing or are imminent because Congress wanted an ability for Congress to stop a war before it started, and that was contemplated in the War Powers Resolution.

I would also point out that the United States is using force to block energy from going to Cuba, and that has led to the cancelation of 100,000 surgeries in hospitals, including 11,000 for children. It has led to massive power blackouts. It has led to the unavailability of clean water because water systems depend upon electric pumps.

My argument would be, if anyone were doing that to the United States and affecting our citizens in that way, we would certainly view that as hostilities that we would want to do everything we could to stop.

With that, Mr. President, pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act for fiscal years 1984 and 1985—that is 50 U.S.C., section 1546(a)—and in accordance with section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge S.J. Res. 124 from the Committee on Foreign Relations, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against the Republic of Cuba that have not been authorized by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all remaining time.

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

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I just want to say I am from Florida, and I probably have more Cuban Americans in my State than anywhere else in this country. This is really important. The Cuban regime has just been despicable. They have killed Americans, and they have destroyed the lives of Cubans for decades. So this has to change.

**POINT OF ORDER**

Mr. President, I make a point of order that this joint resolution is not entitled to privilege under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) due to U.S. troops not being engaged in hostilities.

**VOTE ON POINT OF ORDER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair submits the question to the Senate for its decision.

The question is, Is the point of order well taken?

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. 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. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 108 Leg.]

**YEAS—51**

Armstrong	Boozman	Cassidy
Banks	Britt	Cornyn
Barrasso	Budd	Cotton
Blackburn	Capito	Cramer