

so that there is a consensus of the Nation, after a full debate in view of the American public and a vote, that the war is in the national interest.

If a President goes off unilaterally without getting Congress on board, then we are asking people to risk their lives with no national consensus that the mission is worth it. Could there be a grosser example of public immorality than to order troops into harm's way where they could be killed and their lives and their families affected for the rest of their lives without a national consensus that this is a mission worth you risking your life?

That is why that provision is so sacred in the article I branch, and that is why even George Washington was not entrusted by the Framers of the Constitution to make a decision like this on his own.

I will finish where I started. This is not about dissatisfaction with President Trump. I filed similar resolutions, as my colleague from Idaho knows, when President Obama was President. I came into the Senate in 2013 with an absolute obsession because of the military nature of my State, because one of my kids is a marine—with an absolute obsession that the Nation should never go to war—never—without a debate in Congress that the American people can see, can learn from, and a political consensus that the war is worth it.

Yes, there is an exception for defense or imminent attack. That has been understood as part of the Presidential power of Commander in Chief since the very first days of this Republic.

But even in that instance, it was foreseen that Congress would come in and have a debate and agree or not with whether they blessed the mission or not. Letting a single individual take us to war based on a secret list that he won't even reveal to the public and to Congress sets such a dangerous precedent.

And if my colleagues, as they have stated, believe we should be at war in the Caribbean or at war with nations in the Americas or with the narcotraffickers, they have had the ability the entire time to bring a resolution before us and have that debate in front of the American public. I have a feeling that debate would produce some positive votes if it were limited enough, but to allow a President to do it by secret without Congress having the guts to have the debate and vote about whether the war is worthwhile is contrary to everything this country stands for, to the oath we take.

I would urge folks to support my colleague's resolution.

Mr. President, I ask consent that we yield back all remaining time.

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

The clerk will read the joint resolution by title a third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 71

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read a third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. KAINE. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY).

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 554 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallago	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—51

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Murkowski
Britt	Hoeven	Paul
Budd	Husted	Ricketts
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cassidy	Johnson	Rounds
Collins	Justice	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Cruz Sheehy

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 71) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS—Motion to Discharge

Mr. SCHIFF. Pursuant to Section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act, and as provided under the order of October 7, 2025, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 83, to direct the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities that have not been authorized by Congress, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I strongly support this resolution and commend my colleagues from California

and Virginia for their leadership. In the space of just 4 weeks, the Department of Defense has destroyed four small boats in the Caribbean Sea, in each instance killing everyone on board. Without producing any evidence, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and President Trump have justified these assassinations of civilians on the grounds that the occupants were “narco-terrorists” and “enemy combatants.”

There is not a single Member of Congress who does not abhor the crime of drug trafficking and the horrific toll that illegal drugs, as well as prescription opioids, are taking in this country. Every State is affected. The insatiable demand for cocaine, fentanyl, and other dangerous drugs has ravaged whole communities and caused the addiction and deaths of millions of Americans. There is no question that we are not doing enough to deal with this problem, either here at home or in the source countries. Yet the President's fiscal year 2026 budget would cut hundreds of millions of dollars for drug treatment programs, despite Americans' unmet demand for treatment, and for grants to support State and local law enforcement. It is a glaring disconnect between rhetoric and action. If Congress approves these cuts, we will be complicit with the White House in making this problem worse.

Rather than increasing resources for treatment, local law enforcement, and drug courts, which have long been proven to be the best antidotes against drug addiction and the violent crime associated with it, this administration has labeled drug traffickers as “foreign terrorist organizations” and deployed U.S. warships and other military assets to combat them.

There is no question that drug traffickers, criminal gangs, and other criminal enterprises engage in horrific and violent acts. Murder is murder, whether committed by a human trafficker, a drug trafficker, or a member of al Qaeda. But there are fundamental differences in their motivation, which legally distinguishes a drug trafficker from a terrorist. It is common knowledge that a drug trafficker's purpose is financial enrichment, while the definition of a “terrorist” is a person who uses violence or the threat of violence to instill widespread fear to achieve a political or ideological goal.”

Meanwhile, other governments are using the label “terrorist” to defame and criminalize social activists, political opponents, and journalists who engage in peaceful dissent. This is common practice in Iran, Russia, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia, where dissidents are imprisoned and even executed for being so-called “terrorists.”

Neither the White House, nor the Department of Defense, nor the Department of Justice have publicly provided legal justification for these summary executions of alleged drug traffickers in international waters. They have produced no evidence that the unidentified

people in those boats were in fact trafficking drugs and no evidence that they met the definition of “terrorist.” Extrajudicial killing is a crime in this country and a violation of international law. Simply calling someone a terrorist does not change that.

Our collective interest is in stopping drug trafficking, drug addiction, and the violence associated with it. But above all, we are a nation of laws, and the administration is flagrantly violating the law in ways that threaten all Americans. If the President can label anyone a terrorist regardless of the well-established legal definition, without saying who they are or producing any evidence, and then conducting a military strike on them, where do we draw the line? Is a drug trafficker in Miami or St. Louis a terrorist? Is a bank robber a terrorist? Are kidnappers terrorists? Is the administration going to start calling Americans who protest the arrests of migrants who are legally in this country terrorists?

When asked for an explanation, administration officials routinely ignore the question, insisting that narco-terrorists are legitimate targets. But that is not what the law says. And as Attorney General Bondi often says, no one is above the law. That includes the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice.

Drug traffickers should be arrested, convicted, and punished. Terrorists should be brought to justice. But no American President, Secretary of Defense, or Attorney General has the legal authority to condone or carry out extrajudicial killings when we are not at war, which only Congress can declare, and the country is not facing an imminent attack.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield the floor.

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

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 555 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Paul
Baldwin	Hirono	Peters
Bennet	Kaine	Reed
Blumenthal	Kelly	Rosen
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schiff
Coons	Lujan	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Markey	Shaheen
Duckworth	Merkley	Slotkin
Durbin	Murkowski	Smith
Gallago	Murphy	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hassan	Ossoff	
Heinrich	Padilla	

Warner
Warnock

Warren
Welch

Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—51

Banks
Barrasso
Blackburn
Boozman
Britt
Budd
Capito
Cassidy
Collins
Cornyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Curtis
Daines
Ernst
Fetterman

Fischer
Graham
Grassley
Hagerty
Hawley
Hoeven
Husted
Hyde-Smith
Johnson
Justice
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee
Lummis
Marshall
McConnell
McCormick

Moody
Moran
Moreno
Mullin
Ricketts
Risch
Rounds
Schmitt
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Sheehy
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Tuberville
Wicker
Young

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The motion was rejected.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO “NORTH DAKOTA FIELD OFFICE RECORD OF DECISION AND APPROVED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN”

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The majority leader.

SENATOR SUSAN COLLINS’ 9,750TH VOTE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, Senator COLLINS will cast her 9,750th consecutive vote—her 9,750th consecutive vote.

Mr. President, 9,750 votes is a substantial milestone all on its own, but 9,750 consecutive votes—that is something else.

What it is, is a tribute to Senator COLLINS’ incredible work ethic and her absolute dedication to the people of Maine. Susan shows up for Mainers. She represents them in committee; she represents them on the floor; and she represents them in every single vote—the big votes, the little votes, and the in-between ones. But thanks to SUSAN COLLINS, the people of Maine always have a voice.

Susan, congratulations on yet another incredible milestone.

(Applause.)

Thank you for your service, and thank you for your example.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let’s add one more vote to the total.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I yield back all time on H.J. Res. 105.

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 105

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. LEE. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 556 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hoeven	Paul
Britt	Husted	Ricketts
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Capito	Johnson	Rounds
Cassidy	Justice	Schmitt
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lee	Sheehy
Cramer	Lummis	Sullivan
Crapo	Marshall	Thune
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—45

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Rosen
Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Bennet	Kelly	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coons	Lujan	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Markey	Smith
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Fetterman	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Hassan	Padilla	Welch
Heinrich	Peters	Whitehouse
Hickenlooper	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Booker	Gallago	Tillis
Cruz	Hawley	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 105) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, before I pay tribute to Pastor Bjorge, I just want to say thank you to my colleagues who supported that resolution that you just announced that passed. It is very meaningful to North Dakota, and I express my appreciation for the support.

REMEMBERING JAMES RICHARD BJORGE

Mr. President, “James Richard Bjorge, child of God, went home to be with his Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, on September 29, 2025. He was 94.”

That is the opening paragraph of an obituary for Pastor Bjorge, whose funeral is tomorrow. I will obviously miss it, being here in Washington, but I did want to, first of all, seek unanimous consent to submit his obituary to be printed in the RECORD tonight.

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