

It is my hope that we can all lead our lives with the same courage that Dallas did.

He will not be forgotten, and his spirit of service will live on across Alabama with the many lives that he touched.

Only a couple of months ago, the Montgomery community mourned the loss of David Hathcock, a 20-year veteran of the Montgomery Police Department.

Being a part of any community for that long—much less protecting it every single day—you are bound to make a lasting impact. That is exactly what Corporal Hathcock did. He was considered a leader by those around him, even those who were more senior than him in the department. But, especially, young officers looked to him as they rose through the ranks for guidance and as an incredible example. David led with excellence, pride, and courage, which trickled down throughout the entire department.

His memory will live on through his wife and two daughters, as well as countless colleagues and Montgomery residents whose lives he touched.

And, finally, I would like to recognize Lieutenant Mark Meadows. An Army Ranger veteran, Lieutenant Meadows was no stranger to service.

After beginning his career as a police officer in Mountain Brook, in 1992, Mark found his home in Irondale, AL. He became a fixture of that community, serving the Irondale Police Department for over 30 years.

Outside of work, he was a helping hand to all who needed it, helping to coordinate traffic security or the security at his home church. He did that for more than a decade.

Mark was the real deal and will always be remembered as leaning in and helping those who needed it most.

I want to encourage everyone across our Nation this week to thank a police officer. The stories I just told were those of Alabamians who loved their community, their State, and their country. They displayed that every single day. And as we all know, when police officers leave the safety of their home so we can return to ours, we owe them a debt of gratitude.

These men that we just honored didn't have the opportunity to return home. So don't wait until it is too late. Don't wait until after their service. When you see an officer, let them know how much you appreciate it. Let them know how much you appreciate their sacrifice and service. Whether it is here in this building, which we are so grateful for, whether it is back home, whether it is on the street corner, we appreciate the law and order they bring and making sure our communities are safe and sound.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this Chamber has before it a very important

question: Will Congress embrace and exercise its constitutional responsibility to decide, as Madison put it, the question of war?

That is a heavy responsibility. It is no small matter to decide whether or not the United States should go to war or to decide whether or not to end a war. It is a question of blood and treasure. The lives of thousands can hang in the balance—the lives of soldiers on both sides, the lives of civilians.

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan resulted in the deaths of more than 5,000 American servicemembers and the deaths of approximately 250,000 civilians in Afghanistan and Iraq and they resulted in massive use of American treasure, some \$8 trillion.

It is tempting for Members of this Chamber to shirk this responsibility. The question weighs too heavily on us. "Let's let the President decide."

But if you took an oath to the Constitution, as every Member here did, then you know that letting the President decide is unconstitutional. The Constitution did not assign this weighty issue of war to the President. It assigned this weighty issue to all of us here in Congress.

As Madison summarized: The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone to it. The Constitution has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war in the legislative branch.

With studied care, the Founders said: No one person should decide the question of whether we go to war. The weight of the decision in blood and treasure is too great, so there needs to be debate. There needs to be viewpoints exchanged before such a significant action is taken. And that is why it is assigned to us.

Now the modern version of declaring war is to pass an authorization for the use of military force, or an AUMF. That is the system set up in the 1973 War Powers Act following Vietnam where there was no authorization ever granted, and yet a massive calamity for American servicemembers, some 50,000-plus who died and so many injured and so much treasure expended.

So Congress by law with the signature of the President said: Let's set up a system to take that constitutional provision where the question of war is assigned to Congress and create a format through which it can be considered. And that law—that 1973 law—says the power of war can only be exercised under three possibilities.

One, there is a declaration of war. Second, Congress passes a law and a President signs it into law to create an authorization for war.

And that, in fact, is what happened in the case of Afghanistan and Iraq. The President came to Congress and said: Here are the arguments. I want you to authorize war as required in the Constitution.

This Chamber and the House Chamber considered this question, and we passed an AUMF, an authorization for use of military force.

Those wars were entered into under a constitutional path. And whether or not any one individual agreed with the outcome, at least it was constitutional in that it was the result of studied debate here in this Chamber and down the Hall in the House of Representatives.

The War Powers Act creates a third option. Under a special condition—sometimes it is referred to as "the condition of imminent threat," that we are under attack or on the verge of being under attack. The specific language in the War Powers Act says that the power of war can be exercised if there is a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories, or its Armed Forces.

But it places a 60-day limit on that. Now many experts would say this option was never triggered in this case because there was not a national emergency created by an attack on the United States. But some Members of this body have said: close enough. The threat from Iran was close enough. We consider that a valid third option.

I would disagree, but others had a different opinion and then said: but when that 60 days are up, that is exhausted and the President must withdraw forces as required in the War Powers Act or must come to us with an authorization for the use of military force, which has not happened.

So if the President fails to withdraw forces and the President fails to come to us with an authorization for the use of military force, then it is incumbent on us to pass a War Powers Resolution that says: Mr. President, you are in violation of the Constitution, and you must end this war. If you want to continue it, come and ask for constitutional authorization. The 60 days are up.

Someone said: Well, the war is not as fierce as it was previously. There is kind of a paper version of a cease-fire in place, and maybe that suspends the clock on the 60 days, a clock that expired on May 1.

But, you know, the War Powers Act does not have a provision that says if the war becomes less fierce, it doesn't count against the 60 days. That is not in the law. That is not in the vision under which this was prepared and written for the exercise of our constitutional responsibility.

And everybody in the world knows that the war has continued. The Navy—our Navy—has continued a blockade of Iranian ports. That is an act of war.

Our Navy has fired on Iranian naval vessels. That is an act of war.

Our Navy has fired on Iranian oil tankers. That is an act of war.

And Iran, they also have continued the war. They have fired on United States naval ships, including the use of drones, missiles, and bullets; fired on

commercial vessels; and fired on regional outposts, including the United Arab Emirates.

So the war has continued, and the 60 days has expired. And during those 60 days, a lot has happened; none of it benefitting our national security. We strengthened the Iranian hardliners, virtually what always happens when you assassinate religious and political leaders as we did.

We weakened the reformers. We failed to secure Iran's stockpile of more highly enriched uranium, and we have no strategy to extract them.

We have shredded moral leadership as champions of human rights. We enriched and emboldened Russia by easing oil sanctions; and not only could Russia then sell their oil legally at a higher price, but the war raised the value they could get from \$60-ish to \$120.

We depleted our munitions stockpile. We increased fertilizer costs. We raised prices at the pump for American families.

People keep saying: In our State, it is \$4 a gallon and diesel is \$5 a gallon. Well, in Oregon, it is \$5 for gasoline and \$6 for diesel. And we fueled inflation. Last month, April, the highest inflation in 3 years, 3.8 percent.

Those fuel costs are already affecting businesses. A number of airlines have cut flights and cut services. Spirit Airlines went out of business, forcing them to lay off 17,000 workers. And all across the country, farmers and small businesses and large businesses are seeing these inflationary effects and certainly American families are feeling the higher prices on everything. And we have spent from our national treasure somewhere around a \$1 billion-plus a day.

During his campaign, our President said: I am going to end wars. I am going to lower prices.

But he has started a war, and he has raised prices. And now, if one embraces the War Powers Act, if one argues that there was an imminent threat—which I do not believe that test was met. But if you believe that test was met and you gave the President 60 days of grace—well, those 60 days are up.

And since the President has not come to us and said, "I now want an authorization for war" and we are not debating that on the floor, then our responsibility is to exercise a War Powers Resolution that says: Mr. President, end this war.

It is the right thing for us to do to defend the Constitution we took an oath to. Failure to do so is to violate the Constitution we took an oath to.

So I hope that at this point we will have bipartisan support to embrace the responsibility that the Constitution assigns to us on the question of war. It is a heavy responsibility. It is tempting to shirk that responsibility and let the President decide, but it is neither the moral thing to do nor is it constitutional.

Laws are not suggestions. The Constitution is not an option, not for the President and not for us.

There is no constitutional path for the continuation of this war unless the President arrives today with a proposal for an authorization to be debated. And that has not happened. The only constitutional path left is to vote aye on the War Powers Resolution.

An "aye" vote honors the wisdom of our Founders that assigned us this responsibility and honors our responsibility under the Constitution. A "no" vote dishonors the wisdom of the Founders who assigned this responsibility to us and dishonors our obligation under the Constitution.

Let's carry this weight, however heavy it may be, and in a bipartisan fashion restore and honor considerations that place—the Constitution places with us the question of war. An "aye" vote tomorrow is the right vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to once again call on my Republican colleagues to listen to their constituents and bring an end to this war of choice.

Let's be clear. Americans do not like this war because they are the ones paying for it. American taxpayers have already been forced to shell out at least \$29 billion for a conflict with no end in sight. Hundreds of American servicemembers have been injured, and 13 Americans have lost their lives. And Americans are paying the price for this war at the gas pump every single day as the cost of just about everything seems to be going up.

Today, we learned that inflation tripled in March, showing consumer prices rose by nearly 4 percent. Make no mistake—that jump was almost singlehandedly caused by Donald Trump's war in Iran, which has sent gas prices skyrocketing 50 percent since he chose to start this conflict.

It is not just gas prices and travel costs going up for Wisconsin families; the price of just about everything will increase as transporting goods to markets continues to rise. These cost increases are simply not manageable for many of my constituents and will force them to make impossible decisions.

I am hearing from Wisconsin farmers who are paying through the nose for the fertilizer and diesel they need to plant their crops this spring. As of today, the average price for diesel in Wisconsin is \$5.84 per gallon. That is \$2.61 higher than 1 year ago. One Wisconsin farmer told the local news that he is paying \$2,000 more for diesel fuel this planting season than in previous years. Fertilizer is also getting more expensive because of Donald Trump's war. Fertilizer inputs shot up nearly \$700 per ton in late April—nearly \$250 more than the day before the war started. According to a recent survey, about 70 percent of farmers nationwide say they were unable to afford all the fertilizer they need for this planting season. For Wisconsin farmers who work on very tight margins, these

price increases could be make-or-break for their businesses.

Donald Trump vowed to bring prices down on day one. Instead, he has illegally started a war all on his own that is jacking up the cost of just about everything.

On behalf of our constituents, who are paying the price for this war of choice, I implore my Republican colleagues to do their job and end this conflict. Every day this war drags on is another day that the American people will be forced to pay for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am glad to be on the floor—sixth, seventh, eighth week in a row; I have lost count—this week to support Senator MERKLEY's resolution to end the war in Iran.

It is simple: This is a war that is making America less safe. It is a war that is costing the people of this country billions of dollars. It has resulted in untold numbers of civilian deaths in the region. The entire world economy is spiraling out of control. Prices for gas are through the roof—\$6 a gallon in many parts of the country—and the cost of everything is going to go up very quickly.

But in my short remarks today, I really want to take the administration's war goals at face value and, 74 days into this conflict, assess whether we are closer to meeting those goals or further away.

Secretary Hegseth was before the Appropriations Committee today, and we really got very little information from him as to whether this essential question—the meeting of war goals—is answerable. Let me try to answer it.

The first thing that the administration said they wanted to do was to annihilate Iran's navy. Well, they have essentially destroyed Iran's conventional navy, but they have not destroyed Iran's fleet of speedboats and so-called suicide skiffs that effectively closed the Strait of Hormuz, and it goes without saying that that feat is impossible. The administration will never be able to eliminate all of Iran's small speedboats that drop mines in the strait or threaten to drop mines in the strait and these suicide skiffs, which run these suicide missions at tankers and boats in the strait. So as long as that fleet of small boats is able to harass traffic in the strait, effectively close down the strait, you have not annihilated Iran's navy, and you will never annihilate Iran's navy. So you can claim that you sunk some big boats, but it is the small boats that have closed the Strait of Hormuz and created a global catastrophe.

The second goal that the administration states is to destroy Iran's ballistic missiles. Now, Trump recently claimed that Iran only has 18 to 19 percent of their ballistic missiles left, but according to public reporting, a CIA assessment has found that Iran actually retains 70 percent of its missiles. So we

have expended tens of billions of dollars, we have dramatically depleted our munitions stores, and Iran still has 70 percent of its missiles. That same public reporting suggests that Iran is already starting to dig out from the damage we did and rebuild some of the launchers and the missiles that we damaged.

Similarly, another war aim was to destroy their drone fleet. The CIA assessment says Iran still has 70 percent of its drones. Realistically, drones are so easy to manufacture, there was never going to be a way through an air campaign alone for us to be able to eliminate their drone capacity. It is another reason the strait is closed.

There is no military mechanism available to the United States to open the strait because we cannot find all of their small speedboats, we cannot find all of their drones.

So 74 days of war and billions of dollars spent, over a dozen Americans killed, and Iran still has their drone fleet.

The last goal—and the President has doubled down on this goal—is to stop Iran from ever being able to acquire a nuclear weapon.

Now, we know for sure you can't actually achieve that goal through military action—not without regime change, not without U.S. boots on the ground. The administration has said we are not going for regime change. They seem very comfortable with the new regime, which is, by all accounts, more radical and more dangerous than the regime that they displaced. While Trump still keeps open the possibility of putting boots on the ground, as of today, it doesn't appear that there are going to be hundreds of thousands of American troops going into Iran to take their enriched uranium and their fissile material.

So the only way that you are going to effectuate this goal—stopping Iran from being able to acquire a nuclear weapon—is by taking the same path that we were pursuing under President Obama—a diplomatic path. So the question then is just: Are you going to get a better diplomatic deal today than you got when President Obama was in office? And all the evidence suggests that you are going to get a much worse deal today than you got when President Obama pursued this same path—for two reasons.

First, Iran has much more leverage today. I heard Secretary Hegseth say today in our hearing that America has all the leverage. That is just made up because the facts on the ground are pretty simple.

In 2013, when President Obama was negotiating this deal with Iran, their economy was crippled, but Iran didn't control the Strait of Hormuz. Today, Iran's economy is crippled, but they control the Strait of Hormuz. They have more leverage today than they had in 2013. In 2013, we certainly held open the specter of a military attack, but now Iran has the leverage of know-

ing that it can survive the best punch that America can throw. After 74 days into the war, the regime is still standing. Their missile program still exists. Their drone program still exists. Their nuclear program still exists. They control the Strait of Hormuz. They have more leverage today than they did in 2013.

The second reason you are going to get a worse diplomatic deal is that the stakes are lower for Iran because, once Trump pulled out of the Obama agreement, Iran pressed fast-forward on their nuclear research program.

Before the Obama nuclear agreement, Iran was enriching to 20 percent. The nuclear agreement brought them down to 3 percent. Since Trump pulled us out of that agreement, Iran has gone from enriching 3 percent all the way up to 60 percent. And we all know that, once you are at 60 percent, it is really just a political decision to get to 90 percent, which is what you need for a bomb.

So Iran now has the knowledge, in perpetuity, to be able to very quickly get to enough nuclear material—enriched at a high enough level—to be able to make a bomb.

Maybe, in this agreement, they agree to go back to 3 percent or maybe they even agree to pause, for a period of time, enrichment. That is a different calculation for Iran today than it was in 2013 because they can easily make that agreement knowing that the minute they decide to rush to a bomb, they can get there much faster now because of Trump's decision to pull out of the agreement.

You are going to get a worse diplomatic deal under these circumstances than you got in 2013.

So I just share that with all of you because, even if you take their warnings at face value—and they seem to be changing by the week—they haven't achieved a single one of them, and there is no hope of their achieving those objectives even if they were to restart the war.

So why are we doing this? Why are we doing this if we can't achieve any of our objectives and if the price of the war is being paid for by American citizens and by American farmers?

I understand that the President is full of hubris and pride. I understand my Republican colleagues, in having backed this war, are having a hard time squaring reality with their stated position of supporting the war.

But it is OK to change your mind. It is OK to look at the facts on the ground, come to the conclusion that the war didn't go the way that the President promised you it would go, and join us and vote to end this war. I know that is difficult for any political figure who has made it all the way to the U.S. Senate to admit that they were wrong.

But my Republican colleagues were wrong. Nobody can come to the floor and make an argument that there is a path through the continuation of this war to eliminate their ballistic missile

program or their drone program. I think it would be hard for folks to suggest that the longer this war goes on, the better a diplomatic agreement we are going to get.

So we are going to continue to come to the floor and ask for our colleagues to join us because, out there in the American public, this isn't much of a debate. People want this war to end. They cannot sustain the costs of this war any longer. I appreciate the work of my colleagues in continuing to bring these motions to the floor. This is our one and only opportunity to debate war.

Our Republican colleagues—74 days into this war—have still not brought a resolution before the Senate to authorize the war. That is in violation of the Constitution. Every single day, we as a body are in violation of the Constitution. So it is left to the Democrats to force this debate on a weekly basis, which we will continue to do until this war ends.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today, I come to the floor, once again, after numerous—and I have lost count of how many of these the Democrats have tried—to set the legal record on the war powers straight and in plain terms.

The first thing we need to do is look at what the Democrats are trying to do here. They want to pass this resolution, which states in relevant part:

Congress hereby directs the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against Iran.

So what they are asking and telling the President to do is to remove the U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities within or against Iran. Those hostilities do not exist today and have not existed for some time.

So let's look at what has actually happened from a factual basis.

On February 28, the President exercised his constitutional duty to protect American interests—not his right but his duty that he took an oath to do to protect Americans and America's interests. Not only was the military action he took legally permissible under article II of the Constitution, but it was the President's duty to act.

Presidents across both parties, over many, many years—indeed, many of my Democratic colleagues—have consistently maintained that Iran can never have a nuclear weapon, and with good reason. Iran is a country that is run by radical Shia clerics, whose slogan is, literally, "Death to America." This regime has sponsored terrorism and has kidnapped and killed thousands of American citizens since it commenced this war against the United States 47 years ago.

We all remember when it happened. They took possession of our Embassy in Iran, kidnapped the employees we had there, and held them for 400-plus days. All the action we have taken since then has been defensive. They

have continued offensive actions against us and, as I said, over the years, have killed thousands of U.S. citizens.

The actions taken on February 28 comport with longstanding legal precedent, over many decades, from the Presidents of both political parties. The military operations we are talking about were not and are not—nor are they even close to—operations that took place in Vietnam, Afghanistan, or Iraq, nor will they ever be. My friends on the other side of the aisle have tried to put the two together and compare this to those actions. They are not.

Under the War Powers Resolution, the President is supposed to notify Congress within 48 hours after introducing U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities. He did that on March 2, as required, fully consistent with the law.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the Chamber keep saying that, somehow, the administration is not in compliance with a 60-day clock.

Let me highlight this point: The President's notification to this body on May 1—within that 60-day period—was crystal clear: The operations that began on February 28 had been terminated. The hostilities ended with the April 7 cease-fire. They are over—full stop.

Now, that doesn't say they won't start again. But that operation is over and ended, and we were so notified. Indeed, President Trump's May 1 letter fully informed Congress as to the status of this matter. The War Powers Resolution does not require such reporting. Nonetheless, the President gave it.

In short, this is much more information than previous Presidents have provided to Congress.

For the reasons that I have just stated, I intend to vote against this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, my colleague from Idaho made a few points in his presentation on why he would oppose exercising the War Powers Resolution, and I think it is worth noting those points and considering whether or not they hold water.

First, he said hostilities have ceased because the President says so, but it is the facts on the ground that matter, and the fact on the ground is that the United States continues a blockade—an act of war—against Iranian forces. We have fired upon Iranian ships, and we have fired upon Iranian tankers. Iran maintains a blockade of the Strait of Hormuz, which is an act of war, and they have fired on U.S. Naval vessels, and they have fired upon U.S. commercial ships, tankers. So it may be at a lower level than the massive bombing that occurred before, but there certainly is nothing close to what we would call a cease-fire and certainly not a withdrawal.

Now, the War Powers Act says that after 60 days, you have to end the hos-

tilities, and you can ask for another 30 days to withdraw forces. Well, we are in that 30-day period now, and the forces are not being withdrawn from the Middle East.

The second factor is my colleague cited article II of the Constitution. What did he mean by that? He referred to the "Commander in Chief." Article II of the Constitution says this in section 2:

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service.

When called into service.

And what does the Constitution say about when it is called into service? Well, that is in article I—article I, the powers of Congress, the enumerated powers of Congress, and those enumerated powers laid out in section 8 refer to many of the assignments given, including things like borrowing money on credit or regulating commerce or coining money or providing for the punishment of individuals, establishing a post office. But the key one—this very sizeable responsibility that Madison said "with studied care" the Founders vested this responsibility in the legislative branch, not the executive—that is the power to declare war. That is the responsibility.

Yes, once we go to war, the Commander in Chief is the President of the United States, and much of the strategy of the war is conducted accordingly through the Department of Defense and the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of the services. But do not confuse the ability to conduct a war with the ability to start a war.

Third, nuclear weapons. My colleague mentioned the threat of nuclear weapons. Well, there is a threat of nuclear weapons maybe, but you have to really kind of understand the framework here, and that is that there was a diplomatic agreement in which Iran enriched to only very low levels, a couple percent, under international intensive supervision with all kinds of monitors in place—not just individuals watching but all kinds of sensors in place. Their enriched uranium that they had previous to that agreement called the JCPOA was stored in Russia. So they didn't have highly enriched uranium. They enriched to very low levels, and they did it under international supervision.

It was only after President Trump in his first administration tore up this agreement and unleashed Iran from its responsibilities under that agreement. That is when Iran later said "Well, we might enrich to higher levels" and then proceeded to—up to 60 percent. But that condition only exists because of what President Trump did to tear up the diplomatic agreement.

Then, in June of last year, the United States participated in a massive bombing campaign, employed our very largest bombs to destroy those places where centrifuges were making the more highly enriched uranium. The

President proudly declared that the massive bombs—the largest ones we have, the earth-penetrating bombs, the biggest tonnage—had obliterated Iran's nuclear program.

So Iran didn't have a nuclear program en route to a nuclear weapon until Trump tore up the agreement, and even then, the President claimed there was no nuclear program after June of 2025.

So here we are. What had been achieved diplomatically was destroyed by President Trump. Now he proceeded to say that he had already taken care of this threat that is being cited by my colleague as a justification for this war.

By the way, it was not the justification that President Trump cited at the beginning of this war. No. He said: Israel is going to bomb Iran again, and Iran is going to retaliate against regional sites, and that will involve our interests being hit, so we should join Israel.

So Israel was the dog wagging the American tail. Does America not have the spine, the courage, the authority to simply have told Israel no? Well, apparently not—not under this President.

I yield to my colleague from Virginia who has been so instrumental in bringing many, many insights to this debate and helping coordinate this series of War Powers Resolutions as we strive—strive—to honor the oaths we took to our Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague and strongly support his resolution that will be voted on tomorrow, and I have taken the floor often on this topic and don't need to repeat things I have said before. But today, I guess what I want to say is basically this: The American public does not like being lied to by its government. Of course we don't but particularly on matters of war.

I am old enough to remember two tragic circumstances where the American public was lied to by their civilian leadership about war—many lies were told by successive administrations, beginning with the Eisenhower administration and through Kennedy and Johnson in particular, about the Vietnam war—and how tragic it was when Americans realized that much of what they had been told that led, first, the United States to take over the French colonial project in Southeast Asia and then to engage in war—much of what they had been told was false.

When you are losing your sons and daughters—56,000 U.S. deaths in the Vietnam war—and then you find that the civilian leadership has been lying to you while troops have been serving honorably, it is incredibly embittering in a State like Virginia where there are so many military equities but to every State.

We were lied to about the war in Iraq. We were told that Iraq had something to do with 9/11. That was not

true. We were told that Iraq was pursuing nuclear weapons and had weapons of mass destruction they would use against the United States. That was not true. But those were put on the table before a vote in Congress to engage in a war that most now agree 25 years later was a massive, massive mistake.

So I come from a State that lost a lot of people in Iraq and Afghanistan and Vietnam, and I join my colleague today to support his resolution because I believe the United States is not being told the truth about the situation in Iran.

First, the administration worked very, very hard up until essentially a week or so ago to avoid any public hearings about the war in either the House or the Senate, in the committees that have jurisdiction over important matters. I mean, not to have a public hearing about a war?

Right now—and I am going to go into this in an Armed Services Committee hearing later in the week—the administration is not even willing to share the legal rationale, the opinion developed by the Office of Legal Counsel at the State Department. They are not even willing to share that rationale with Members of the U.S. Senate. They won't share it with members of the Intel Committee. They won't share it with members of the Armed Services Committee. They won't share it with members of the Foreign Relations Committee. They won't even share the legal rationale. What are they afraid of? That raises some natural suspicion.

In at least two instances, I believe the administration is not being truthful with the American public about this war. One was the assertion of a whole different series of rationales, but one of the rationales that seems to now be the one that they rely on is, well, of course the war is needed to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. No, it isn't. We had stopped Iran from getting a nuclear weapon by a diplomatic deal that Donald Trump chose to tear up, as my colleague just mentioned. That had stopped Iran's nuclear program.

That deal was a comprehensive deal that took months, even years, to negotiate. It contained some provisions that were time-limited—5 years, 10 years, 15 years, 20 years—but it contained two provisions that were permanent. The first was on page 1 of the deal: that Iran will not seek to purchase or acquire or develop nuclear weapons. That was a permanent pledge by Iran. The second part of the deal that was permanent was Iran agreed to permanent inspections by the IAEA, including inspections according to an additional protocol that had been developed by the nations of the world after North Korea had cheated on a nuclear program earlier.

Those were permanent pledges by Iran to not pursue nuclear weapons and to allow intrusive inspections, and President Trump decided, over the objection of his Secretaries of State and

Defense, to tear up the deal. So when President Trump says now: Well, we have to wage war; we have to subject our troops to being killed and being injured and billions of dollars of costs and Americans and people all over the world paying more for gas to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon—that is a lie. Diplomacy had stopped them until President Trump tore it up.

To make matters worse, President Trump, with the United States, following a 12-day war of Israel against Iran to destroy their nuclear capacity, took additional action that the White House said had destroyed Iran's nuclear program.

So if we had controlled it first by diplomacy and then a year ago added on a war waged by Israel against Iran to obliterate the nuclear program, there was not a nuclear program that justified this war. There was no threat of any action anytime soon by Iran to develop nuclear weapons that justified this war.

I don't like to use this phrase. I don't use this phrase a lot: The White House has lied to the American public, and every time they say this war is justified to stop Iran's nuclear program, they are telling the American public a lie.

The second lie they are telling—and I will just say this and then hand it back to my colleague—is a different kind of a lie. If you state a set of facts that are true but you don't state the full set of facts, you are telling a lie. And I have heard President Trump and I have heard Secretary Hegseth say many times: We need to stop Iran because they have been a thorn in our side since 1979. They have been a thorn in our side for the last 47 years.

Our decision makers are acting as if the U.S.-Iran history started in 1979 when the Iranian people toppled their government and then, yes, in the aftermath of that toppling, started to say "Death to America," "Death to Israel." They act like that is the only history. My colleagues will recount Iranian misbehavior—taking over our Embassy, in violation of international law; funding proxies to attack the U.S. Embassy and Marine barracks in Beirut and other locations; funding proxies that attack U.S. troops who are in the region in or near Iran—my colleagues will cite that information, and they will cite it accurately. And Iran has done a series of horrible things to their own people, to American positions, to other nations in the region. But my colleagues always ignore, the President always ignores, and Secretary Hegseth always ignores that history didn't start in 1979.

If you want to understand the history of this relationship between the United States and Iran, you have to go back to World War II when we were allies. There was a pivotal conference in the middle of World War II in Tehran in 1943 where the allies—the United States, the Soviet Union at the time, and Britain—guaranteed to Iran its

sovereignty and its independence and its borders, and the Iranian people loved the United States, and we were allies.

Then in 1953, during the Eisenhower administration, the United States made a catastrophic mistake. There is a recent book by Scott Anderson called "King of Kings" that lays this out in clear and unmistakable detail. The United States decided we would topple the democratic Government of Iran. In 1953, the United States, through the CIA, engineered a coup. We toppled the democratic government. We installed the Shah, a dictator. We funded the secret police of the Shah, who tortured, exiled, imprisoned, and killed thousands of Iranians. And the United States basically put this puppet government—a dictator—over the Iranian people from 1953 until they finally tired of it, and they cast that government off in 1979.

Guess what. Twenty-six years of the United States funding a dictatorship killing and torturing Iranians led the new Government of Iran to be—drumroll—anti-United States. We turned Iranians from friends into enemies. We didn't have to do that, but we did it.

Secretary Hegseth and the President never mention that. They don't mention that after Iran overtook our Embassy, we funded Iraq to wage war on Iran. We gave Iraq funds. We gave Iraq intel. And in a 7- or 8-year war, Iraq—we funded Saddam Hussein to wage war against Iran. Hundreds of thousands of Iranians were killed, and they knew the United States was partially responsible for it.

In the late 1980s, a U.S. Navy vessel, the *Vincennes*, shot down an Iranian commercial aircraft, killing 290 civilians. It took us years to admit that we did it, but we eventually admitted that.

The United States invaded Iran's next-door neighbors to the east and west to topple their governments—Afghanistan and Iraq—and Iran believed: Well, you toppled our government in 1953. You are probably preparing to do it again.

In this recent war on Iran, we have wiped out their leadership, we have killed civilians, and we bombed a school, killing schoolgirls. Now, we all know that the United States does not intentionally decide to target schools. That is not what we do intentionally. But to an Iranian who watched the United States intentionally topple their government in 1953, intentionally participate in an assassination campaign against their leaders, shoot down a civilian aircraft in the late 1980s, intentionally fund Iraq to wage war against Iran—an Iranian will look at U.S. actions and say: Wait a minute. This is part of a pattern. We were friends until you decided to topple our government in 1953.

The point I am making about this is that if you are not willing to be honest about the history and acknowledge not

only Iranian misbehavior—which continues to this day. They just executed somebody in Iran—a student—in a gross violation of human rights. So you have to acknowledge that the Iranian regime has conducted all kinds of bad activities. But if you are not willing to acknowledge the role the United States has played in turning this nation that was a nation of allies into enemies, then you are going to get the policy wrong. You will get the policy wrong if you don't acknowledge the truth.

What is that truth? as I finish. The truth is, if more war between the United States and Iran would bring a solution to any of these problems, then we would have found the answer at some point between 1953 and now. We have had a back-and-forth going between the United States and Iran since 1953, and it has not produced peace, it has not produced stability, and it has not produced anything for the good of the Iranian people or the American people, frankly. For us to think now that, you know what, more war, just a little more war would be the right thing to do to bring a better resolution to this painful 75-year chapter—it shows a profound ignorance of our history and a just shocking level of naivety.

So that is why I have joined with my colleagues every week to look this Senate in the eye and say: As a deliberative body with constitutional powers and an oath that we have taken to provide a check against an Executive—particularly on matters of war—we can't let this go under the radar screen, classified hearings only. We have to be as loud and consistent as can be to say that more war between the United States and Iran is not an answer to anything. It hasn't been an answer to anything since 1953, and it is not an answer to anything now. That is why I support this resolution.

We should not be at war without a vote of Congress. Even if there were such a vote—I would vote against it, but if it were to pass this body and be signed by the President, I would then drop my complaint that the war is illegal. I would say it is unwise, but I would be outvoted, as I am often on events, and thus it wouldn't be illegal.

It is an illegal war. It is an unwise war that demonstrates a profound lack of understanding of the deep, tragic history between the United States and Iran. And for that, to my colleague from Oregon, I strongly support your resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

NOMINATION OF KEVIN WARSH

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the nomination of Kevin Warsh to be the Chair of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve system.

I want to put this nomination in some context. Donald Trump's chaos is not working for the average American. Housing is more expensive; healthcare

is more expensive; groceries are more expensive; American manufactures' inputs are more expensive; and gas is more expensive due primarily to the President's unwise and unauthorized war with Iran.

That is quite a list of higher prices and economic chaos, and it is no secret President Trump also thinks he should control the actions of the Federal Reserve. He has tried to fire some of its members, threatened others, and even launched a criminal investigation meant to force out Fed Chair Jerome Powell.

The Federal Reserve is tasked with combating inflation and helping maximize employment. This dual mandate helps companies succeed and Americans find work and support their families.

The American people need and deserve a Fed Chair who is committed to this task—whose sole motivation is meeting the Fed's dual mandate and who is dedicated to the Federal Reserve's independence.

But after attempting to oust one Fed Governor, as well as the current Chair, President Trump appears to have found an individual who will operate according to his wishes, not the Fed's dual mandate.

And I am not simply speculating. President Trump explicitly told America he would pick a Fed Chair committed to his preferred monetary policy—"someone who believes in lower interest rates by a lot"—and publicly confirmed Mr. Warsh fit that bill.

The President has made clear he believes the Fed should shed its independence, arguing, "I'm a smart voice and should be listened to." And Mr. Warsh himself testified the Fed should not be fully independent.

Undermining Fed independence is extremely dangerous. The last time a President exerted control over the Fed was President Richard Nixon in the early 1970s. The Fed artificially kept rates low—exactly what President Trump wants today—which helped cause, in the case of Nixon, massive stagflation.

Now, President Trump wants total control of the economy by installing his pick to lead the Fed. And based on the President's track record, we should all be very, very wary. Since President Trump returned to the White House 16 months ago, the United States has added only 420,000 new jobs, and that is a huge drop from the 1.5 million jobs the United States added during President Biden's final 12 months in office.

Similarly, workers' real wages grew at a slower pace last year than in 2024, while GDP growth significantly slowed from 2.8 percent to 2.1 percent. Indeed, a greater share of Americans are unemployed now than when President Biden left office.

Zoom out. How did we get here? It becomes clear. The President's tariffs walloped Americans to the tune of \$1,000 in new costs per family last year, according to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation.

Gas prices are up 50 percent since the President began his war on Iran, with diesel prices \$2 higher and home heating oil prices also jumping up significantly.

Researchers at Brown University estimate Americans have spent an extra \$38 billion on gas and diesel since the war began—that is \$290 per household in a little over 2 months. The President's war with Iran pushed inflation to a 3-year high in April with prices for gas, food, clothing, and housing increasing significantly.

Making matters worse, President Trump cut nearly \$1 trillion from Medicaid last year. As a result, insurance prices and costs are increasing so that roughly 15 million Americans will lose their healthcare insurance over the next decade.

About 1.5 million people have already dropped their Affordable Care Act coverage as a result of the President's cuts. In my home State of Rhode Island, 10,000 people lost their health insurance. The President has created huge new costs for families, and households are stretched thin. Unsurprisingly, credit card balances hit a record \$1.3 trillion at the end of last year. People are living month to month on their credit cards, and that is not a hopeful sign for working Americans.

But with the President's help, one set of Americans did exceptionally well in 2025: the ultrarich. Investment bank UBS reports that the number of U.S. billionaires jumped 11 percent last year with their combined wealth reaching \$6.9 trillion dollars. That is trillion with a T.

Now if you dig a little deeper, you will see President Trump's billionaires are leaving the rest of America further and further behind. Billionaires' wealth grew 18 percent in 2025. In comparison, the average wage for Americans grew by about 4 percent—18 percent for the billionaires; 4 percent for working Americans.

As a result, wealth inequality—the gap between the ultrarich and the rest of us—is at a record high. According to the Federal Reserve, 32 percent of total U.S. wealth is now held by the top 1 percent of households.

That is a new record. It is a very uncomfortable record to observe. Let me say it again: 32 percent of the total wealth is now held by the top 1 percent.

That is not what America was designed to be. Frankly, that was not what generations of men and women in uniform fought to make America be. They weren't worried about making sure that billionaires had 5 yachts, 25 cars, and 7 mansions. They wanted to make sure that children got fed; that there was affordable housing; that families could not only get by but save a little and give their children a good chance in life.

Now there is a direct and likely intentional line between billionaire profits and the President's policies. President Trump's tax and spend plan was