

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

them a clear, thoughtful, rational plan for what comes next.

Some 2 months later, the regime retains the ability to strike across the region. They continue to disrupt shipping through the Strait of Hormuz. And while the administration may point to ongoing negotiations, events on the ground and the rhetoric coming out of Tehran tell a different story.

If the United States steps back abruptly and prematurely, we almost certainly leave their critical capabilities intact, we risk a new set of leaders who are even more radicalized against us, and we all but invite retaliation against American military forces, our allies, and the American people.

Those are not risks I am willing to take. But the answer is not a blank check for another endless war, nor is it open-ended authority for the administration, with no guardrails, no oversight from Congress, and no clearly defined mission. The answer, I believe, relies on careful, deliberate use of congressional power. And this is where I think we are falling short, because we are approaching the 60-day mark under the War Powers Act.

So what comes next?

The Constitution is clear on this point: Congress holds the power to declare war and authorize the use of military force. And yes, the President must have flexibility to respond to emergencies and imminent threats, and he does. And he does. But those are not ongoing military campaigns like we find ourselves currently mired in.

In such conflicts, the President and the administration must explicitly state their goals, their plans, and the metrics for success, and if we don't press them to define those parameters, we may risk repeating history.

One of the clearest lessons from the War on Terror is that the failure to think beyond the initial phase of military operations can lock us into a conflict that becomes more lengthy, more deadly, more costly, and more difficult to unwind, which brings me to a concern I have had from the outset of this conflict, and that is the lack of clarity from the administration, from their public statements to the classified briefings we receive as Members of Congress.

When American servicemembers are deployed and lives are on the line, the administration owes Congress and the American people a straight answer about what we are trying to achieve. That is why I have been working with several of my colleagues on an authorization for the use of military force.

This is an authorization, but it is also a restraint. It is not a blank check. It would not grant open-ended authority. Instead, it would seek to establish a framework requiring the President to come to Congress with clearly defined political and military objectives. It would require metrics for success, notice of any changes in objectives, and exit criteria. It would ultimately ensure that Congress is engaged.

AUMFs should precede wars, not be enacted in their midst.

That wasn't a choice for us here, but it cannot be used as an excuse to abandon our responsibilities. We are supposed to represent, engage, debate, vote, and when and where necessary, restrain the Executive. That is why we are supposed to be here in Congress, and that matters most in times of war.

We have already lost servicemembers in the conflict—and God rest their souls—and there is still danger, and more servicemembers will almost certainly be put in harm's way even during an economic blockade.

Now, I think there is a fair and legitimate question that some may be asking. We are looking at an AUMF. We just had a vote on a War Powers Resolution. Actually, we have had several votes on War Powers Resolution, and I have opposed each of them, including the one that we just took today.

So why AUMF and not a War Powers Resolution? The War Powers Resolution we have voted on would have required the removal of U.S. forces from active hostilities. They would have halted operations that were already underway without any framework for what comes next, and that is just something I can't support.

Iran has been targeting United States personnel, our allies, and our partners across the region. I don't believe that we can responsibly tie the hands of our military or walk away in the middle of an ongoing fight without a plan.

We saw in Afghanistan in 2021 the dangers of withdrawing without a strategy. The President should have come to Congress before engaging in military action at this scale that we are seeing now, and that, regrettably, did not happen. So we are now in a position where Congress must step in—not to abruptly end operations but to define them. And that is the difference here.

The War Powers Resolution has attempted to stop this conflict without establishing a path forward. An AUMF recognizes the reality that the U.S. military is already engaged and provides structure and clarity by requiring the administration to define what they are trying to achieve and the means of achieving it. It requires reporting to Congress, and it brings transparency where little has existed over the past 2 months.

Now, I am not introducing an AUMF today, but if we pass this 60-day mark from the start of hostilities with still a lack of a credible plan and information from the administration, it is something that I intend to introduce once the Senate reconvenes here.

So I want to close by saying as plainly as I can: I stand firmly behind our troops. As part of that, I do not take their deployment lightly, and I do not accept that we should engage in open-ended military action without clear direction or accountability.

Congress has a role. Congress has to step up and fulfill that role, that obligation that the Constitution assigns to us. We owe it to the men and women who are serving our great Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I don't know if you remember 1977. But since 1977, this body has passed the 12 appropriation bills on time 4 times since 1977. By the way, this year is not one of them. Since 1977, four times the budget process has worked correctly.

We have had multiple different government shutdowns during that time period, but they are getting worse—not better, as this Congress continues to be able to find cliffs to be able to stand next to and figure out how long we can put our toes over the edge.

The latest one ended today. It was 76 days long, and it shut down the Department of Homeland Security. Now, I remind everyone in this body, the first priority of the U.S. Government is defense and security—the first priority.

This body decided not to fund Homeland Security for 76 days. This is an issue we have got to face.

In 2019, my friend MAGGIE HASSAN the Democratic Senator from New Hampshire, she and I sat down and said: We have got to figure out how to get out of this. This is a cycle that is continuing.

And since 2019, she and I have worked across the aisle to convince our colleagues there is a way to prevent future government shutdowns that would hold Congress accountable but the American people and Federal workers would not feel the effect of it. And it is a very simple straightforward idea that we have worked on now since 2019. It is when this body has not finished their work on time, we stay until the work is finished.

But Federal workers and their families and the programs that are all connected to those Federal dollars, they continue. They are held harmless, while we have to stay until it is done.

Now, that may seem simple, but around this place, that is a radical idea, apparently. We have worked for years to be able to get to the point that we can pass it.

Last session, we brought it to this body and had 57 votes; we need 60, as this body knows full well. We had 57 supporters last time we brought it to this body.

Now, there has been an election since then. We have also had two very long shutdowns since then, and my understanding is there are even more of my colleagues that are stepping forward and saying it is time that we end the shutdown dramas and actually get things resolved.

We don't bring a political solution; we don't bring a messaging solution; we just bring a solution. This solution had been evaluated in previous Presidential time by President Biden's team