

for continuing this war and for continuing this disastrous price escalation on ordinary Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of the American people who are against Donald Trump's illegal war with Iran. This war has taken the lives of 13 servicemembers—hundreds more are injured, many severely. This war has cost American taxpayers upward of \$25 billion and is jacking up the cost of energy, fuel, and fertilizer for Wisconsin families and farmers.

I have been clear since this conflict began 2 months ago: President Trump did not have the authority to start this war with Iran. We were not under attack from Iran. We were not under imminent threat of an attack from Iran. Therefore, President Trump was required to ask Congress, the people's branch, for authorization.

The Trump administration should have made the case to us and to the American people for why an all-out war with Iran was worth it. But the Trump administration did not follow the law. Donald Trump dragged the United States into a war of choice without a clear explanation.

It happened without open hearings or public debates or a timeline. He started a war with Iran without a clear reason or plan to get us out. That is why we are still at war 2 months later.

The Trump administration keeps saying that this will not be another endless war, but this administration still hasn't committed to a timeline for getting us out.

I have watched my Republican colleagues bend over backward to explain why they have abdicated their duty to be a check on President Trump, but even if this war of choice was allowed under law, Congress still has to play a role.

I wholeheartedly disagree with my Republican colleagues who said Trump could wage this war for 60 days without getting Congress' approval. But regardless, that clock that they just set up has run out. We are coming up on 60 days since the President notified Congress of military action in Iran. And as Republicans keep telling me, that deadline matters. On the 60-day mark, President Trump must cease military action or receive congressional authorization. My Republican colleagues know this. They have said as much, calling this deadline a "big deal" and a "trigger" that requires Congress to act.

So here is Republicans' chance to act. You said the President had 60 days to wage a war and that he needed Congress to sign off? Well, it has been 60 days. It is time to do your constitutional duty to rein in this President and stop this illegal war that is jacking up Americans' costs while accomplishing next to nothing.

Iran still has nuclear materials. They still have ballistic missiles and drones

to attack us, a blockade on the Strait of Hormuz, and the same oppressive regime in place. It is time to show the American people where you stand on this war. Join us in forcing the Trump administration to come to Congress, to explain to the American people why we are at war, and make their case for why this war should continue.

If they can't, then we shouldn't be at war, period.

I yield the floor.

(Mrs. MOODY assumed the chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). The Senator from California.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) and section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 184.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 184, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

Mr. SCHIFF. For the last 8 weeks, I have taken to the Senate floor to oppose the Iran war. I have pointed out the lack of an imminent threat from Iran and the shifting justifications for the war.

I have enumerated the many costs of the war in blood and in treasure, in higher gas prices and costs of groceries. And I have lamented the loss of 13 servicemembers including a Californian and the injury of scores of others.

Today, I rise to sound the alarm about another risk of this war and that is that the administration is poised to violate the War Powers Act and that if we permit such a flagrant violation of the law, we, the Senate, and the Congress, will have surrendered the war power completely to the Executive.

This would be enormously dangerous and wrongheaded. I believe it is also in direct contravention of the Constitution and our duty to uphold it.

At midnight tonight, it will be the 60th day since Donald Trump notified Congress under the War Powers Act that we were at war with Iran—60 days. It is also a moment that some of my Republican colleagues have pointed to as a turning point in their consideration of the legal and constitutional bases for the Iran war.

That is because under the War Powers Act of 1973, a President is legally mandated to remove military forces from a conflict if Congress has not

voted to authorize it within those 60 days.

As we have all acknowledged, the President can order military action in response to an armed attack or the imminent threat of an attack if those dangers require immediate action, but that power and responsibility is not unlimited.

After 60 days, he must seek an authorization from Congress to continue the war or, failing to receive it, he must order the withdrawal of our forces.

Now, some of my colleagues across the aisle have argued that the President properly began this war because they believe that we faced some form of an immediate threat to our forces or our allies. But they have also affirmed that the President's authority to use military force expires after the 60 days set out in the War Powers Act.

Now, I strongly disagree with the argument that we faced an attack—or an imminent threat of attack—from Iran, justifying this war. But I respect the fact that some of my Republican colleagues have acknowledged that authority, if it exists, lapses tomorrow night.

This military operation has been carried out by the Commander in Chief for the past 60 days. We have multiple carrier strike groups, tens of thousands of servicemembers, pilots and sailors and soldiers and marines, all serving halfway around the world and now for 60 days.

In addition to the 13 servicemembers who have lost their lives, more than 200 others have been seriously—or have been injured, and some seriously. The letter of the law is clear. This is what the act says "Within sixty calendar days after a report"—and that is a report on the beginning of hostilities like the one we received from the President on March 2—"Within sixty calendar days . . . the President shall terminate any use of the United States Armed Forces with respect to which such report was submitted . . ."

"Shall terminate."

That is "Unless the Congress has declared war or has enacted a specific authorization for such use of [the] United States Armed Forces."

Now this is important. The law does not turn on the introduction of an authorization to use force or committee consideration of such an authorization or even a Senate floor vote on an authorization. No, the law requires the enactment of a war authorization. Failing that, the law requires the President to remove U.S. forces.

This is the case unless the Congress changes the War Powers Act itself, which we have not done, or cannot meet as a result of an attack, which is demonstrably not the case because, well, we are all here.

Those are the only two carve-outs. There are no other exceptions. If the President is still using the military for the same purpose as he was 60 days earlier and there has been no authorization of military force enacted—or war

declaration—the President must terminate this use of force until Congress says otherwise.

Now, some might argue that because we are not currently bombing Iran—because there is a tentative cease-fire in place—that somehow the War Powers Act no longer applies, that somehow the war powers clock stops ticking. But this is simply not true.

The United States Navy is still being used to interdict Iranian ships or ships embarking from Iranian ports. We are still using our Navy to blockade Iran. Our servicemembers are still at risk. And there is no provision in the War Powers Act to suspend the clock when military force is used in one respect but not another.

For the law says:

The President shall terminate any use of [the] United States Armed Forces . . .

There is no exception made for the Navy or the use of naval forces. Now, the law allows for a 30-day period for a safe withdrawal if the administration seeks it, but the President has not requested one. It is important to note that the purpose for an extension is explicit in the law. It exists:

If the President determines and certifies to the Congress in writing that unavoidable military necessity respecting the safety of [the] United States Armed Forces requires the continued use of such armed forces in the course of bringing about a prompt removal of such forces.

The President has made no such certification.

And so I say to my colleagues: This is the moment you have pointed to and waited for. This is the moment when Congress must assert itself. This is the moment when we must recognize that the Founders gave Congress alone the power to authorize war. The moment of reflection and action that you have identified—and I respect you for doing so—is here.

And we must take action. We should all bear in mind that today's vote is simply to bring a resolution to the floor to discharge my resolution S.J. Res. 184 from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee so that it can be debated by the Senate. That will happen well after the 60-day clock has expired.

Colleagues, we must not move the goalposts again. If we do, we surrender all authority to authorize war to the President, and he already has enough power. What we have remaining is already so greatly diminished, already a poor reflection—a mere shadow—of the power granted to us by the Constitution and our Founders.

The War Powers Act was a product of a bipartisan, bicameral agreement which took years to negotiate in the aftermath of the Vietnam war, another deeply unpopular war that stretched far longer than the American people wanted.

Consider the words of one of the law's authors Senator Jacob Javits a Republican Senator from New York, words he spoke on the Senate floor while Senators overrode a Presidential veto of

this law with a full 75 votes in the Senate and nearly 300 in the House.

Senator Javits said “No one is impairing the President's authority to carry on the foreign policy of this country. Let us not confuse this with foreign policy. Foreign policy does not mean war, and war does not mean foreign policy, unless there is a breakdown or failure of foreign policy. Congress is determined to recapture for ourselves the representatives of the people at the State level in the Senate and as the House did on the local level, the awesome power to make war. When we judge, by this measure”—he said—“that an incident would become a war, then we, and we alone, have the right to decide that it shall go on into war or that it shall stop. For the Constitution lays upon the Congress, unmistakably, the responsibility of deciding whether or not the state of our Nation should be changed from peace to war.”

Senator Javits understood the criticism that would be leveled against the act—and those who supported it—by President Nixon and his allies, but he also understood that the Constitution was clear. And he helped draft a law that upheld, reinforced, and strengthened the separation of power between a Commander of Chief and a Congress empowered to authorize his use of that command for the purpose of making war.

Our war power is given clearly by the Constitution, but it is a muscle. And if we do not exercise it, it will not hold our weight. And Congress for years has allowed that muscle to atrophy.

Mr. President, 50 years ago Republicans and Democrats alike tried to reinvigorate our war power with an eye to restoring the authority that Congress possesses but which the Vietnam war had eroded. We must not ignore that law now.

For the sake of all 13 families that have already lost someone to this senseless directionless war, for the sake of future generations who may be sent into battle without the approval of Congress or the American people, by a President grown too fond of war, this has to be the moment we stand up. This has to be the moment we say enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in just a few hours, it will be 60 days since Donald Trump officially notified Congress he was dragging us into one of the most foolish foreign misadventures in American history. Pete Hegseth can't just hit the pause button on that countdown, not when American troops are in harm's way.

For 60 days, Trump has blundered, stumbled, and straggled through this mess of his own making. For 60 days, prices on everything from gas to groceries have soared at a rate not seen in years. For 60 days, military families have stayed up at night, praying their loved ones won't join the ranks of the

brave 13 American servicemembers killed and nearly 400 wounded. And after 60 days, Republicans have sat idle.

Well, I say to my colleagues: Time is up. Republicans, stop sitting out. Start speaking up. The American people have had enough. They have been calling for peace for weeks. Americans literally cannot afford this war to drag on, not when gas costs \$4.30 a gallon—\$4.30 a gallon—and inflation just hit a record for over 3 years for 3.5 percent, higher inflation than we have had in a long time. And that means people pay more for just about everything.

This sixth vote on the Democrats' War Powers Act is different than the first five. The 60-day threshold for war powers is upon us. No more dodging. No more hiding. No more shirking. Republicans need to help us end this illegal, costly war. They should have done it long ago. The most important vote a Senator can take is on matters of war and peace.

I hold our Republican colleagues to show an ounce of courage our brave members are showing in the field every day as this war continues and to do what is right. Do your duty.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I know of no further debate.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: The Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and The Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 113 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
Collins	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Ossoff	Warren
Gallego	Padilla	Welch
Gillibrand	Paul	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—50

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

Fischer	Lankford	Rounds
Graham	Lee	Schmitt
Grassley	Lummis	Scott (FL)
Hagerty	Marshall	Scott (SC)
Hawley	McConnell	Sheehy
Hoeven	McCormick	Sullivan
Husted	Moody	Thune
Hyde-Smith	Moreno	Tillis
Johnson	Murkowski	Wicker
Justice	Ricketts	Young
Kennedy	Risch	

NOT VOTING—3

Moran	Murray	Tuberville
-------	--------	------------

The motion was rejected.

(Ms. LUMMIS assumed the Chair.)

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

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the Republican conference be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions from April 30 through May 11.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDING THE FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008 TO EXTEND THE AUTHORITIES OF TITLE VII OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4465, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4465) to amend the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 to extend the authorities of title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, and for other purposes.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me pick up on where I think the majority leader wants to go as well. We have been working hard on the 702 legislation with the kind of lodestar that we want to prove that, for the first time, the government is saying that liberty and security are not mutually exclusive; that we can do both.

To do that, we now have a letter that will be sent very shortly from Chairman COTTON and Ranking Member WARNER to the DNI and the Attorney General. I just want to read this—it is very short—into the RECORD that will reflect this, and then we will have a brief colloquy, the majority leader and I, that is along the lines of what we talked about.

So Chairman COTTON and Ranking Member WARNER write to the DNI and the Attorney General:

Earlier this month, the Department of Justice delivered to Congress a classified Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) opinion and order, dated March 17, 2026.

Under the law, your offices are currently conducting a declassification review for the purposes of making this FISC opinion and order publicly available, consistent with the protection of sources and methods, as soon as practicable. In order to inform the Senate debate on reauthorization of section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, we expect that this declassification review will be completed, and the FISC opinion released publicly, within 15 days.

So, again, this is coming from the chairman of our committee, Chairman COTTON, and Senator WARNER, our vice chairman. It is going to the DNI and the Attorney General, and to make sure that everybody understands the state of play here, a formal letter is being written, and we are just getting the signatures on that now. Everyone is waiting to hear where things stand.

And with that, let me yield to my colleague the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has referenced a letter, and my understanding is that both the chair of the Intelligence Committee Senator COTTON and the ranking member on the Senate Intelligence Committee Senator WARNER have agreed to this letter, and it reflects what the Senator from Oregon is asking for.

And so I think that, hopefully, at this point, we will be able to proceed and allow for additional time and consideration so that we can come to an agreement that, hopefully, this body and the House can agree upon to reauthorize the FISA Program.

I think there is a discussion going on about reforms to that. But this will allow additional time to do that. In the meantime, I think, again, my understanding is, the chair and ranking member have signed off on the letter to which the Senator from Oregon refers.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the majority leader states it correctly. That is my understanding as well. The point of this is to have some additional time. This is a very new period in this debate with, for example, AI driving so much of this. And you know, new tools require new rules, and we are going to be able to think about how to proceed with that in the future.

I yield my time. I thank the majority leader for, in effect, reaffirming what we have been working on. I think that this letter from the chair and the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, where I am proud to serve, to DNI and the Attorney General is a step in the right direction.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. THUNE. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the bill, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 4465) was passed as follows:

S. 4465

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES OF TITLE VII OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) EXTENSION OF REPEAL DATE OF TITLE VII.—Section 403(b) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-261) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) (50 U.S.C. 1881 note), by striking “April 30, 2026” and inserting “June 12, 2026”; and

(2) in paragraph (2) (18 U.S.C. 2511 note), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “April 30, 2026” and inserting “June 12, 2026”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or April 29, 2026.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

IRAN

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am here to speak this afternoon about the conflict involving Iran and more specifically, the role of Congress within it.

At the outset, I want to reiterate something that I think gets lost in these discussions. The fact of the matter is, the Iranian regime is not an abstract adversary of America or anyone who supports free people and a more peaceful world.

For 47 years, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard has brutalized their own people in the name of preserving the power of their Supreme Leader. Protestors and dissenters are met with violence, imprisoned, and murdered in cold blood.

At the same time, that same regime, through its proxies and networks, has killed thousands of Americans over the years. They have empowered groups like Hezbollah, Hamas, and Shia militias in Iraq to orchestrate significant attacks that have destabilized the region.

There is no doubt that the Iranian people would be better without the Islamic Republic of Iran. There is no doubt that the world would be a safer place without the regime spreading terror around the world.

We now find our Nation at war with Iran, and I am not here to relitigate how we got into this conflict. The fact of the matter is, we are in it. But we owe it to our servicemembers and the Americans who are feeling the economic impacts of this war—we owe