

day will never come where men and women of honest hearts and good faith cannot come together and find common goals worth fighting for together.

BILL and I have served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on the Senate Commerce Committee, but the principal area where BILL and I have had the privilege of working closely together concerns space. BILL and I have worked hand in hand promoting and protecting America's program of space exploration and supporting the critical institutions in the State of Texas, the State of Florida, and throughout the country that have made our country a world leader in space. It has been a truly bipartisan partnership. Both BILL and I believe that America is and should be going forward the leader in space, that we have a responsibility, and that there are great and glorious things to accomplish for mankind through space exploration. In this time of bitter, partisan division, of nasty personal rivalries, we have been able to see truly bipartisan cooperation.

We worked together hand in hand on the 2015 commercial space bill, passed into law and signed into law by President Obama. We worked hand in hand on the NASA Authorization Act of 2017. We worked hand in hand and passed that into law, signed into law by President Trump. There are very few major, substantive areas that have major legislation, one signed by Obama and one signed by Trump. I think that is a reflection of the bipartisan cooperation we have seen.

We worked hand in hand on the Space Frontier Act, and we are working together to extend the operation of the International Space Station to 2030. That accomplishment, that cooperation is good for America, and it is good for our leadership in space.

I have to say that I am still jealous that, unlike Senator NELSON, I haven't been on an actual trip to space for a hands-on experience, but I suppose anything can happen.

BILL, I promise you, our work will continue. America's leadership in space will continue. We will persevere and constantly show those who say it can't be done that there is still the will to drive, to explore, to create, to learn, and to search the unknown for answers.

BILL, you are right—I believe that in our lifetime, a human being will step foot on the surface of Mars and that the first boot that lands on the red planet will be the American boot of an American astronaut planting the flag of the United States of America.

There is still a will in our Nation to tame the stars and behold the wonders of creation even closer. I will say that spirit of exploration also inspires generations of little boys and little girls who look to the skies and wonder, what if? We cannot limit our gaze on the Earth below us; it isn't in our nature.

I will say finally, in addition to his commitment to space leadership—and I would note that in addition to BILL's

bipartisan cooperation, his team worked hand in hand with my team, both committed to passing meaningful, important legislation, to finding compromises that would make it not just through the Senate but through the House and be signed into law, and the members of his staff were skilled and dedicated partners in producing those results.

But I will tell you, beyond that, on a very personal level, BILL is a good man. Just a moment ago, when I congratulated him on his farewell speech, he chuckled and said: I may be one of the only people who have taken you to dinner. And you know, that is right.

I remember back in 2013—my first year in this body—it was a tumultuous time. We were in the midst of battles where more than a few bare-knuckle punches were being thrown all around. Right in the midst of that, BILL said: Ted, why don't you come out and have dinner with Grace and me. The two of them took me to dinner, and we had a delightful, relaxing, engaging dinner. We didn't debate big policy; we simply talked as three human beings privileged to have the chance to serve our country. It was a gesture of friendship.

We all know that Harry Truman famously said: If you want a friend in politics, buy a dog. That has not been the approach BILL NELSON has taken to politics. He extended a hand of friendship, and that blossomed into cooperation, and it blossomed into accomplishments together for the United States and for the States of Florida and Texas.

BILL, it has been a privilege to work with you, and I look forward to continuing to work with you in the years ahead in your next chapter. It is an honor to serve with you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 54.

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

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 261 Leg.]

YEAS—60

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

NAYS—39

Alexander	Gardner	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeben	Rubio
Corker	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott
Cotton	Isakson	Shelby
Cruz	Johnson	Sullivan
Enzi	Kennedy	Thune
Ernst	Kyl	Toomey
Fischer	Lankford	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) to direct the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe there are problems with the law governing the consideration of these types of resolutions. One of biggest is the consideration of amendments. I have a series of parliamentary inquiries that I think will help clarify the problems with the statute.

Parliamentary inquiry: Does this statute provide any guidelines for the consideration of amendments on this resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it does not. The statute does not set forth the text to be used in the joint resolution, and this statute uses the expedited procedures from the Arms Export Control Act, a statute which does not allow amendments, so there are no parameters for the consideration of amendments built into the language.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe that most times the Senate uses expedited procedures, we have either a germaneness requirement for amendments or they cannot be amended. Can the Chair expound on what some of those are and what that concept means in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Generally speaking, when the Senate considers a measure under statutory expedited procedures, like the Budget Act, the Congressional Review Act, the Trade Act, or the Arms Control Act—or

even under the Cloture Rule—there are guardrails for the consideration of the measure and for amendments thereto. There are statutes and rules with prescribed text, limits on debate time, jurisdictional fences, filing deadlines, and germaneness requirements or a complete prohibition on amendments. Often, there are points of order and waivers written into the structure as well. The Senate trades its normal procedure of unfettered debate and amendment and the need for 60 votes to end debate and consideration for a more predictable, structured, and streamlined process of consideration and a majority threshold vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. In the opinion of the Chair, is a statute with no end point for consideration and no restrictions on text or amendments consistent with the other expedited procedures which the Senate often uses?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The construct is inconsistent with the concepts embodied in other expedited processes—even those that are themselves flawed—and the opportunity for abuse of this process is limitless.

Mr. McCONNELL. I agree with the Chair, and I think the Senate should speak to this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I think it is important when using expedited procedures, especially on matters of national security such as this, the Senate limit consideration to the matter at hand. Therefore, I raise a point of order that amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) must be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The laws governing the consideration of this type of resolution do not prescribe what type of amendments can be considered. The Senate has not previously considered this question; therefore, the Chair submits the question to the Senate for its decision. Shall amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered?

The question is debatable for 1 hour. Mr. CORKER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I just wanted clarification. Was it section 1546 or 1446?

You are right, OK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded.

The question is, Shall amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered?

Mr. McCONNELL. 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. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 262 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Gardner	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Barrasso	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Grassley	Perdue
Blumenthal	Harris	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Brown	Heitkamp	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Cantwell	Hirono	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sanders
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schatz
Casey	Isakson	Schumer
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Collins	Jones	Shaheen
Coons	Kaine	Shelby
Corker	Kennedy	Smith
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cotton	Kyl	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Leahy	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall
Duckworth	Markey	Van Hollen
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Warren
Ernst	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Wyden
Flake	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—3

Cruz

Lee Paul

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The point of order is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to use an oversized floor display.

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

YEMEN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about one of the great humanitarian crises facing our planet, and that is the horrific war in Yemen.

In March of 2015, under the leadership of Muhammad bin Salman, who was then the Saudi Defense Minister and is now, of course, the Crown Prince, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates intervened in Yemen's ongoing civil war. As a result of the Saudi-UAE intervention, Yemen is now experiencing the worst humanitarian disaster in the world.

According to the United Nations, Yemen is at risk of the most severe famine in more than 100 years, with some 14 million people facing starvation. In one of the poorest countries on Earth, as a result of this terrible war, according to the Save the Children organization, some 85,000 Yemeni children have already starved to death over the last several years, and millions more face starvation if the war continues.

Further, Yemen is currently experiencing the worst cholera outbreak in

the world, with there being as many as 10,000 new cases each week, according to the World Health Organization. This is a disease that is spread by infected water that causes severe diarrhea and dehydration and will only accelerate the death rate. The cholera outbreak has occurred because Saudi bombs have destroyed Yemen's water infrastructure and because people there are no longer able to access clean water.

Last week, New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof wrote an article, which I urge all Members to read, that describes his recent visit to Yemen.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the New York Times article, "Your Tax Dollars Help Starve Children."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 7, 2018]

OPINION—YOUR TAX DOLLARS HELP STARVE CHILDREN

(By Nicholas Kristof)

ADEN, Yemen.—He is an 8-year-old boy who is starving and has limbs like sticks, but Yaqoob Walid doesn't cry or complain. He gazes stolidly ahead, tuning out everything, for in late stages of starvation the human body focuses every calorie simply on keeping the organs functioning.

Yaqoob arrived unconscious at Al Sadaqa Hospital here, weighing just over 30 pounds. He has suffered complications, and doctors say that it is unclear he will survive and that if he does he may suffer permanent brain damage.

Some 85,000 children may have already died here in Yemen, and 12 million more people may be on the brink of starvation, casualties in part of the three-year-old American-backed Saudi war in Yemen. United Nations officials and aid experts warn that this could become the worst famine the world has seen in a generation.

"The risk of a major catastrophe is very high," Mark Lowcock, the United Nations humanitarian chief, told me. "In the worst case, what we have in Yemen now has the potential to be worse than anything any professional in this field has seen during their working lives."

Both the Obama and Trump administrations have supported the Saudi war in Yemen with a military partnership, arms sales, intelligence sharing and until recently air-to-air refueling. The United States is thus complicit in what some human rights experts believe are war crimes.

The bottom line: Our tax dollars are going to starve children.

I fell in love with Yemen's beauty and friendliness on my first visit, in 2002, but this enchanting country is now in convulsions. When people hear an airplane today in much of Yemen, they flinch and wonder if they are about to be bombed, and I had interviews interrupted by automatic weapons fire overhead.

After witnessing the human toll and interviewing officials on both sides, including the president of the Houthi rebels who control much of Yemen, I find the American and Saudi role in this conflict to be unconscionable. The Houthis are repressive and untrustworthy, but this is not a reason to bomb and starve Yemeni children.

What is most infuriating is that the hunger is caused not by drought or extreme weather, but by cynical and failed policies in Riyadh and Washington. The starvation does