

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the war in Gaza has been a humanitarian catastrophe, and tens of thousands of civilians have been killed and wounded. Thousands of children are not able to obtain medical care that they urgently need. Hundreds of thousands of people in northern Gaza have been told to relocate again and again and again. There is no safe place for these innocent people to go in Gaza. Also, 100 precious lives of hostages do remain in Hamas control. And I am very upset about the escalation of anti-Israel sentiment here in our own country.

But everyone is painfully aware that Hamas built its underground system of tunnels and military command beneath Gaza schools, hospitals, and other civilian structures. It is a very difficult dilemma, but the answer is not the entire destruction of Gaza.

And Secretary of Defense Austin said that “there’s a better way” to prosecute the military campaign and to eliminate Hamas while protecting civilians. That is our military leader. And that is a sentiment that is shared by many U.S. military officers, both active and retired and, incidentally, many Israeli officers.

Israel has received, as my colleague from Texas knows—and as my colleague from Texas also knows—Israel has continued to receive massive amounts of U.S. weapons, ammunition, and other military aid. And the Congress passed an emergency supplemental, in addition to the fiscal year 2024 appropriations bill. And together, they provide, literally, billions of dollars—billions of dollars—in military aid for Israel. So the suggestion that Israel is lacking for U.S. weapons and ammunition is without any merit whatsoever.

The conflict between Israelis and Palestinians will not be solved with more bombs, particularly when the Netanyahu government has yet to articulate achievable goals or a credible plan for what comes next after the war ends—something that many Israeli citizens are pointing out and objecting to the manner in which Prime Minister Netanyahu is conducting this war.

In the meantime, starvation is escalating for women and children—innocent people in Gaza—who had nothing to do with what happened on October 7. And, incidentally, as the Senator from Texas knows, every single one of us in the Senate is absolutely horrified by what Hamas did on that day, October 7. And as my good friend from Texas said, that was the worst mass murder of innocent Jewish people since the Holocaust—horrifying.

I think it is fair to say that everybody in this body wants the war to end. They want a secure, peaceful Israel, and we want a secure, peaceful Palestinian State. But the suggestion that the U.S. Government is not providing significant aid to Israel, which I have objected to but this Congress has supported by a very large margin, is flatout wrong.

So for these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES.

89

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I move to discharge S.J. Res. 89 from the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 89, a joint resolution to direct the termination of the use of United States Armed Forces for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Joint Logistics Over-the-Shore pier on the coast of the Gaza Strip that has not been authorized by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable for 1 hour.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the Gaza pier is a perfect example of the Biden administration’s foreign policy incoherence. This was a nearly half-billion-dollar stunt trying to buy a few votes in Michigan. It has been an unconscionable waste of American taxpayer dollars, and, simultaneously, it has undermined America’s geopolitical credibility with our allies.

The pier is unnecessary. We can debate whether sufficient aid is getting to the Gaza Strip, but I believe that our Israeli allies have taken unprecedented steps to ensure that indeed there is. I understand that many Democrats disagree.

What is undeniable, however, is that whatever aid is coming in, it has not, will not, and, indeed, could not have come through this God-forsaken pier. The operation was simply too insignificant and too convoluted.

Moreover, we know that Hamas diverts aid delivered through this pier. The pier has also been reportedly attacked by Palestinian terrorists, and three U.S. servicemembers have been injured because of pier operations.

Further, the pier has cost American taxpayers a minimum of \$320 million to construct. And that was an estimate from April, so it is surely higher now.

Meanwhile, we have required our Israeli allies to provide a “security bubble” around the pier. We are pressuring them to protect this operation, which is bringing supplies hijacked by Hamas.

Joe Biden is asking Israel to protect the Gaza pier from Hamas while denying Israel the weapons to counter Hamas. And as we just saw, Senate Democrats are endorsing that policy. I find it difficult to think of a more ridiculous policy.

Let’s be clear. American policy should be unequivocal: We need to ensure that Israel has the military and diplomatic support to utterly eradicate Hamas. That is good for Israel, and it is good for America.

Unfortunately, we have seen a recurring theme from the Biden administration and from Senate Democrats: Undermine Israel at every step of the way and aid terrorists at every step of the way.

In fact, this administration has been the greatest friend to Hamas and Hezbollah and the greatest ally to Ayatollah Khamenei on the entire planet. Under the Biden Presidency, over \$100 billion has flowed to Iran, and \$6 billion of it was in ransom for five Americans—a policy which I warned at the time would lead to more Americans being taken hostage. Tragically, on October 7, we saw that come to pass.

Where we are now is the Biden administration is sending money to Gaza, and they are combining it with blocking weapons to Israel. The policy is utterly backward. If you were to ask anyone on the street “What should we do on foreign policy?” they would say that we should support our friends and stand up to our enemies. Unfortunately, Joe Biden and the Democrats—their policy—has blocked weapons to our friends, blocked weapons to Israel, and sent billions of dollars to our enemies who are actively trying to kill Israelis and actively trying to kill Americans. It is Alice in Wonderland through the looking glass.

What the Senate should be doing is voting on the legislation the House has already passed to provide the weapons Israel needs now. Just a minute ago, I tried to pass that here on the floor of the Senate, and you saw Senate Democrats object to that. Why is it that we are not voting right now on providing the weapons to Israel that Joe Biden has blocked? Because Senate Democrats do not want to vote on it.

The only reason it didn’t pass a minute ago is that a Senate Democrat objected and did so on behalf of all of the Democrats, and we know that it is all of the Democrats because CHUCK SCHUMER is the majority leader of this body. Senator SCHUMER could schedule the House bill for a vote anytime he wants, and he said he will not allow it to come to a vote.

So understand, if you support Israel, the reason the Biden administration is able to block weapons from going to Israel is because every Senate Democrat is standing in solidarity with this White House in blocking weapons from going to Israel in a time of war.

The reason you heard the words “I object” is some Senate Democrats don’t want to go on the record for that. They don’t want to actually cast the vote.

The Senator who objected is from the State of Vermont. Vermont is a bright-blue State—a State that they comfortably believe is safe to make an objection. Senators who are on the ballot in red or purple States are not eager to go on record on this question.

Procedurally, I do not have the ability to force a vote on passing the already passed House bill that would provide immediate weapons to Israel.

There is not a procedural vehicle to do that, but there is a procedural vehicle to vote on the mirror image of that policy. If we can't vote in saying America should provide weapons to our friend the State of Israel, what we can vote on is if we should stop giving money to our enemies—to Hamas.

The Gaza pier is flowing money to Gaza that is benefiting Hamas. Under the War Powers Act, I have the ability procedurally to force a vote, which we are about to have, on whether to cut off that money.

Everyone at home, I want you to understand this is a vote, yes, on the Gaza pier and, yes, on cutting off money to Hamas, but it is also a vote on the other half of the policy: Should we provide weapons to Israel?

I would have more than happily withdrawn this war powers resolution if—if the Democrat majority would have allowed a vote on the legislation that has already passed the House providing immediate weapons to Israel, but Democrat leadership doesn't want that vote. So I am going to force the only vote we can get.

Understand, when you see Democrat after Democrat after Democrat walk down to the well of the Senate and vote—I am going to make a prediction—they are going to vote quietly. You may see a couple—a couple—who have been among the loudest opponents of Israel. A couple may vote loudly, but most Democrats are going to walk in very quietly and go to the clerk and go “no” or maybe point down quietly, but it is not going to be a vote they are proud of. It is going to be a vote that they hope their constituents don't know about, that they hope the men and women they represent don't hear about, and it is going to be a vote, sadly, that simply reflects party loyalty in that the Biden White House has cracked the whip and has said: We support our enemies; we oppose our friends. Now fall in line and vote accordingly.

I am hoping that Senate Democrats will rediscover that the Senate is an independent body; that the Senate doesn't work for the White House even if your own party is in charge; that the Senate was designed to provide checks and balances on the President, especially concerning foreign policy; that the Senate was given by the Framers of the Constitution unique responsibilities concerning foreign policy: the responsibility to declare war, the responsibility to ratify treaties, the responsibility to confirm Ambassadors, to confirm the Secretary of State, to confirm military officers. The Framers designed the Senate to check an Executive, whether from your own party or the opposing party.

There is a long history of Senate Democrats who were willing to stand up to Democrat Presidents. You know, there was a Senate Democrat named Scoop Jackson. Scoop Jackson actually had the courage to stand up, even if it was a Democrat President, and

fight for American national security. I wish we had even one Scoop Jackson Democrat left in the Senate, even one Democrat who would stand up and say: Look, I am with the Biden White House most of the time, but on cutting off weapons to Israel, on funding Gaza, on sending money to Iran and Hamas, enough is enough. I can't do that.

It is within the prerogative of every Senator to do just that, and I would note it is possible.

You know, we just had a Senate Judiciary markup where, going into the markup, everyone assumed that a judicial nominee from New York was going to be voted favorably out of the Judiciary Committee.

Now, this was a particularly radical nominee. This was a nominee who as a magistrate judge had ordered a 6-foot-2-inch biological man who was a serial—repeat—rapist to be housed in a women's prison, putting every woman in that prison at risk of sexual assault or rape. It was an extreme and radical nominee. I and others led the opposition to it.

I will tell you, we just had the markup. We walked into the markup, and everyone assumed, as has happened for 3½ years, that the Democrats would vote like the politburo—“da”—and vote for whatever extreme nominee was in front of us. Something shocking happened. When the vote happened, one of the Democrat Senators, the Democrat Senator from Georgia, voted no, and the nominee was defeated.

I am going to point to that as an example to the Democrats in this Chamber. I understand that the White House expects you to fall in line, that President Biden is coming to join you for lunch today, but every Senator has the prerogative to make their own choice: Do you agree with undermining Israel? Do you agree with flowing money to Gaza and Hamas and Iran and terrorists who want to kill us? If you don't, the people of your State have elected you and given you the prerogative and given you the voice to stand up and say no to this policy that is endangering America and endangering our allies.

I urge every Member, Republican and Democrat, to stand together, united. It would be powerful if we saw a bipartisan vote saying: We stand with our friends, and we stand against our enemies, and enough with this nonsense of funding people who want to kill us. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, just to alert our colleagues, it is my intention at the end of this debate to make a point of order that this joint resolution is not entitled to privilege under 50 U.S.C. 1546a due to U.S. troops not being engaged in hostilities, but in order to allow the debate to continue, I will withhold that motion until the end of discussions.

This resolution that is before us would be an unprecedented invocation of the expedited procedures in the War

Powers Resolution. I am a strong supporter of the War Powers. I think it is an appropriate use of oversight on our power to commit our troops to harm's way. This resolution does not seek to remove U.S. forces from hostilities but, rather, to end a specific mission. The War Powers is to deal with our military troops, not to deal with tactical military and nonmilitary actions. The Senate should not allow the privileged vehicles intended for entirely different purposes to be used as a backdoor effort to stop humanitarian assistance.

Let me be clear about this. American boots are not on the ground in Gaza. The U.S. troops who are operating the pier in question are not engaged in hostilities or in carrying out a mission that requires the authorization of the use of military force. They are facilitating the delivery of food, water, and other basic humanitarian assistance. The supplies are not even being delivered by U.S. forces.

Let me just call to our colleagues' attention what is included in the War Powers Act itself. It deals with U.S. Armed Forces when they are “[i]nto hostilities, or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, and to the continued use of such forces in hostilities or in such situations.” That is not what we have here in regards to the pier, so this is not the appropriate use of the War Powers Act.

I might tell you, this is somewhat moot because we expect, by the end of this month, for the pier operations to cease.

In any event, I think it is important for this body to make clear that we support the War Powers. This is not an appropriate use of the War Powers. For that reason, I will be making a motion, at the end, of a point of order.

I understand some of my other colleagues have some points, so I will yield the floor, but I will ask for the floor before the end of the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator CARDIN and basically of the concerns we have of the War Powers Act and in diminishing the act to the point that we can't really react to the needs that we have around the world in trying to defend ourselves and help our allies.

I agree also with Senator CRUZ that this pier has not worked, that it has not done what it was intended to do. There have been difficult conditions, and a lot of money has been spent. To go any further is needless.

I intend to enter into a resolution—to have a resolution for today—that basically will do exactly what Senator CRUZ has said in his, except we will do it as a sense of the Senate versus invoking the War Powers Act. I will ask for consent and hopefully receive the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. That will be later. We will do it today before we leave.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from West Virginia.

I think my colleague is going about it the right way in dealing with the substance of the issue through a resolution and not by invoking the authorities we have for expedited procedures under the War Powers Act.

For that reason, I later intend to make a point of order.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland said that he intends to raise a point of order objecting to this war powers resolution because we do not have servicemembers in harm's way; we do not have active hostilities, which is what is required by the War Powers Act. That is a creative procedural argument. It just has the inconvenient fact of not being true. Not only is it not true, but what the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is arguing to this body is directly contrary to the explicit position of the Biden Department of Defense.

I want to read to you from a press briefing from the Biden Department of Defense on May 16. A reporter asked the official spokesperson for the Department of Defense:

The USAID spokesperson said yesterday that he wasn't satisfied yet with the deconfliction arrangement yet, and then he added that the maritime corridors exposed to—we do not think the JLOTS of the maritime corridor is exposed to any additional risk above and beyond that which is already present in Gaza. That's pretty frightening now, isn't it, given how many people have been killed . . .

Answer—and this is from the Biden Department of Defense:

I don't think we've come up here with rose-colored glasses and said this is not a risk. This is an active war zone.

The Biden Department of Defense has explicitly stated: "This is an active war zone"—that they are putting U.S. personnel at risk. And that is precisely why the War Powers Act gives this body the ability to act.

I would note, as well, my friend from West Virginia said he wanted a sense of the Senate but not to use the War Powers Act. The War Powers Act is a way for Congress to exercise its prerogative.

Over recent decades, we have seen the Senate hand away much of our responsibility on foreign policy and national security to the executives. That is contrary to the design of our Constitution, and it is, frankly, harmful to the Senate and harmful to this country.

We are not merely a body that has a sense of the Senate. Look, I assume I will join with whatever the sense of the Senate is. If it says this is a dumb idea, I will join that. But while we are at it, we ought to rename a post office.

The Senate exists to do more important things than make general musings into the ether. The Senate has the con-

stitutional power and, under the War Powers Act, the legal and statutory power to say: Stop spending money to send U.S. service men and women into harm's way.

Now, far too often, the Senate has stepped out of our historic role in foreign policy and has said: Whatever the President wants, we, the Senate, aren't going to say anything about it.

When there is a Republican President, Democrat Senators suddenly discover their voice and say: Hey, the Senate ought to say something.

But when it is a Democrat President, it seems no matter how incoherent and disastrous the foreign policy from the Democrat President, Democrat Senators don't want the Senate to exercise its authority.

I will reiterate the offer that I made just moments ago to the staff of the Senate majority leader: I will withdraw this war powers resolution if the Senate votes on the legislation that has already passed the House to provide the weapons that the Biden White House is blocking to Israel.

The Democrats don't want to do that because they don't want their Members on record. And because they don't want their Members on record, this is the only vehicle I have, because, procedurally, under the statute, I have a right to force a vote on this.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said there are not active hostilities. The Biden Department of Defense has explicitly disagreed.

To quote again:

I don't think we've come up here with rose-colored glasses and said that this is not a risk. This is an active war zone.

That means the War Powers Act fully applies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, there is no dispute that there is active hostility in Gaza. That is not the issue. The question is whether American troops have been engaged in that hostility, and they are not. That is when the War Powers Act is triggered.

American presence through missions are common in areas surrounding active hostilities. That is not unusual. So the use of the War Powers Act in this circumstance would be unprecedented.

I would urge my colleagues to recognize there are other ways we can express ourselves. I thank Senator MANCHIN for giving us that opportunity. But this is the wrong procedure to use.

And if all time is yielded back—

Mr. CRUZ. It will be momentarily.

Mr. CARDIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. A very brief response to what my friend from Maryland said: The pier was fired upon twice. It is difficult to say that we are not in active hostilities when we are being fired upon, and so it clearly falls under the statute.

With that, I yield all further time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. In a brief rebuttal, I will tell you a mission dealing with humanitarian assistance is not introducing our soldiers.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I yield back our time, and I make a point of order that this joint resolution is not entitled to privilege under 50 U.S.C. 1546a 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.

Is the point of order well taken?

Mr. CARDIN. 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 Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Butler	Kelly	Sinema
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Lujan	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Padilla	Welch
Fetterman	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Ricketts
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Mullin	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	
Graham	Ossoff	

NOT VOTING—6

Capito	Markey	Romney
Daines	Menendez	Scott (FL)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 46. The point of order is

well-taken. The motion to discharge falls.

The point of order is sustained and the motion falls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and that at 1:45 p.m. today the Chair execute the order of July 9, 2024, with respect to the Meriweather nomination.

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

The clerk will report the Meriweather nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robin Michelle Meriweather, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

WAR POWERS

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, the Senator from Arizona, I want to speak just briefly about the vote that we just cast but, more than the vote, the topic that it represents.

The pier constructed to deliver aid to Gaza is a failure, was a failure, and it was a very expensive failure, and it has cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. It was an idea poorly conceived and poorly executed. It is unsustainable to maintain, and it is not fulfilling its purpose. It should be dismantled, and there are already plans underway to eliminate the pier after remaining aid has been distributed or removed.

Our U.S. forces, as they were in this instance, were called upon to deliver aid to areas of the world that are plagued by violence or areas that are hostile to the United States. And my complaint about the planning is nothing to distract from my admiration and respect for those who serve our country, and that continues in those individuals in the military who have served in the effort to try to provide aid to the people of Gaza.

But this is not an isolated instance in which the United States and its military are asked to serve. The United States has previously assisted Iran after a devastating earthquake. This year U.S. forces delivered aid to Haiti, which is racked with gang violence. The capabilities of the U.S. military and the generosity of the American people to help innocent victims, no matter who they are or what government rules over them, is a testament to America's goodness and to American power.

The point I want to make is the War Powers Resolution allows Congress to remove forces "engaged in hostilities without specific authorization." I want to caution my colleagues against uti-

lizing these authorities and setting a precedent that Congress can or should intervene any time we simply don't like the entity, the people, who are receiving the aid.

I wholeheartedly respect Congress's ability to utilize war powers when appropriate. There is no greater responsibility we have than deciding when to send our sons and daughters to take part in a war. This decision should not and must not be allowed to reside with the President, with the executive branch alone. Yet, too often, it is exactly what we do, ignoring our obligations as Members of Congress.

The Framers of our Nation determined that war is to be declared by Congress. And in too many instances and way too often, we fail to live up to our constitutional responsibilities.

I believe there are many more opportunities more pressing and more damaging to our troops than just this failure of the pier, where Congress could and should intervene. At this moment, for example, the U.S. sailors are engaged in kinetic activities against the Houthis without any such authorization. Just like the Gaza pier, the Biden administration has placed servicemembers in harm's way without any strategy for success, at significant cost to taxpayers and finite defense munitions. This pier demonstrated President Biden's ham-fisted approach to the Middle East.

Why should we allow him—but the point is broader than that. Why should we allow him—or any President—to continue missions that are adrift and have no prospect of a solution? It is a failure on Congress's part to assert our constitutional obligations in matters of war.

Today's vote was a step—a step, I think, in the right direction—but we have much more to do to carry out the responsibilities we were elected to. I have said this on the Senate floor many times: When Congress looks the other way, when a President of either party issues executive orders or rules and regulations that make no sense under the law that was enacted that they are operating under, it is important, I think—again, I have said this on the floor before too many times—people just want the result they want, and they don't care about the process by which they get it. And the process is what protects our freedoms and liberties. The process is what the Constitution is about, and we ought to be fulfilling our constitutional responsibilities, certainly when it comes to the ability to have members of our military in harm's way.

Our freedoms and liberties are determined by that. The Framers understood that this country should not have a king and that the powers are vested in the legislative branch, not the executive.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

REMEMBERING JAMES M. INHOFE

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I rise today to take a moment to reflect on the remarkable life of Senator Jim Inhofe, who passed away and is now spending time with his Lord and Savior in heaven.

I rise for a number of reasons: One, because he was such a fantastic public servant who served our Nation in the U.S. Senate for nearly 30 years. I rise because, as a member of the U.S. Army, he served his Nation valiantly and selflessly. I rise because here is a man of great faith who dedicated his life to public service.

But I also rise because of the slanderous headlines that marked his death. People wonder time and time again why the American people continue to lose faith in our media, when the headlines from Associated Press or Politico, New York Times and ABC News reflects a partisan difference on policy and leads them to label his death in such a negative way. It does, indeed, cripple their credibility in the eyes of the American people when the Washington Post speaks of the death of an ISIS terrorist by saying he was an austere, religious scholar at the helm of the Islamic State. But Senator James Inhofe, the Oklahoma Senator and climate change denier, dies at 89. It saddens me, as an American, that our press pays so little attention to the sacrifice of public servants and so much respect for those who kill because they can.

Jim Inhofe will be remembered in Oklahoma and around the country as a man of deep faith, as a man who sacrificed on behalf of a country that he dearly and deeply loved, and as a man who brought people together in Bible studies and faith communities and, frankly, around the world.

I remember traveling with Senator Inhofe a number of years ago on what we call a congressional delegation. It was a 7-day trip with 10 country stops. If you wanted to sleep on Senator Inhofe's codels, you slept on the plane because there was too much to do when the plane landed.

I recall him bringing together African leaders who had been warring against each other, and having a moment of prayer before he found a way, courageously, to bring two warring factions to the same table to solve deeply rooted problems that seemed impossible to solve.

I remember with great affection seeing some of his reelection acts, where he was flying a plane upside down at the age of 84 or 85.

Jim Inhofe was a great man, and his family does not deserve to read the headlines of media outlets that denigrate his public service, denigrate his character, and lessen his reputation. Thankfully, no one can touch his character. They can only darken the shadow around it, because he indeed was a man of great character.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.