

of Charlie Brown, constantly being told that the football will not move, that the end is near, only to have peace snatched away time and time again.

And so, in this moment, Congress cannot accept a vague promise of a future end to the war as a substitute for the very definite terms of the War Powers Act. The President should come to Congress for our authorization to keep troops deployed to the war zone or bring them home. Those are the only two choices the law provides.

After all, this war began without the administration making the case to Congress or the American people. There was no attack on the United States by Iran, nor was there any imminent threat. This was a war of choice, and it was chosen by the President.

In the months since, the administration's rationale for the war has shifted many times over time, with the President and his Cabinet alternately claiming an imminent threat from Iran's nuclear program, which they also claimed to have been obliterated by an attack by the United States 9 months earlier; claiming an imminent threat of a missile attack by Iran on our homeland, which the United States intelligence community concluded was, in fact, 9 years away; claiming this was the best opportunity for the Iranian people to rise up against the regime, then saying they would get mowed down if they did, with more vacillating, inconsistent, and implausible justifications for the war given every week.

And now we have little more than a deal to make a deal. Initially, the agreement seeks to rebuild the status quo that this war shattered by reopening the strait. But even this preliminary agreement is contested, with the President saying Iran won't charge any tolls, but with Iran saying it may charge "fees" for the crossing.

And the future deal on nuclear weapons, although still very much a work in progress, appears little different than the agreement that President Obama negotiated and Trump disavowed—although the present deal seems far better for Iran than that deal since Iran may receive 10 times the billions it did under the Obama JCPOA and also be a party to a \$300 billion reconstruction fund.

Imagine that: You paid \$60 billion more for gas during the war, and those billions you paid at the pump are going to go to Iran for rebuilding.

High gas prices are just one of the costs that have been borne by the American people over these 100 days. The region has been in chaos, along with global shipping. As a result, the price of Americans' grocery bills has been much higher, the cost of fertilizer for farmers much higher, and the price of energy bills much higher to heat our home in winter and to keep it cool in summer. Everything is going up, up, up—except the incomes of the American people.

And, most significantly, American servicemembers' lives have been lost.

That has been the most terrible price of this war.

Americans wanted a President who would bring down their cost of living, lighten their economic load, and deliver a better future for their children, address their rising rents, their inability to afford childcare, their difficulty getting a health plan or a good education without breaking the bank, to address their anxiety when the fridge runs empty or the gas light comes on. But this President did the exact opposite.

And now we are told that Iran—not the United States taxpayers, who footed the bill for all of this—may be set to receive \$24 billion in sanctions relief and another \$300 billion in reconstruction reparations and investment.

This war of choice was brought to America by a President who promised no more foreign wars, no more Middle East wars, no more regime change wars; someone who said on election night to the entire world, "I'm not going to start a war; I'm going to stop wars" but now says, "I didn't guarantee no war" and that he didn't build such a powerful military for nothing.

So let's look at the record of this President who promised no more wars and that he would focus on the problems of Americans here at home: 200 people killed in boat strikes in the Eastern Pacific and Caribbean Sea, with more strikes every week; an attack on Venezuela, capturing President Maduro and now leaving in power his corrupt second in command, long past the time when that country's constitution demands a new election and the country's rightful President, the winner of Venezuela's last election, is relegated to the sidelines, little more than an afterthought; and now the stationing of American military right off of Cuba, blockading that country and indicting its leaders.

The war in Iran is far from over, and the President seems to be promising another one when it is, saying, with respect to Cuba, he likes to do things one at a time.

We have in this moment an opportunity to show the President and the country that we are listening to our constituents, that we hear their concerns, that we will do our job to make their voices heard, to bring down the cost of living and address the difficulties they find in just making a go of it.

We have a responsibility to uphold what our Founding Fathers gave us: a Constitution that provided Congress with the power to make war, not the President. We can bring our troops home, and we can return our attention to our difficulties at home and rein in a President that has now become all too fond of war.

We have found a majority to carry this motion once before. We can do so again. The American people are counting on us to send this resolution to the Oval Office with bipartisan support and to end this war of choice once and for all.

Our constituents cannot afford to risk another 100 days of war, and—if we are to be more than a constitutional appendage—neither can we.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I rise to speak, along with my colleagues, on the War Powers Resolution, followed by Senator WARNOCK, that will be called up soon.

I have spoken on this topic often, about once a week, since the war against Iran began at the end of February, sometimes speaking on behalf of my own resolutions and sometimes speaking on behalf of the resolutions of colleagues. I am very happy that Senator WARNOCK's resolution will be called up today. I believe he will be the last speaker before we begin voting.

And you have heard from other colleagues. I won't belabor a point that I have made often on the floor, but I do want to talk about this particular moment in time.

I do believe this war is illegal because it has not been authorized by Congress. I believe the war is unwise because we had a diplomatic deal that was controlling Iran's nuclear program that President Trump tore up. And thus, this is a war that was not necessary if the United States had done what we normally do and preferred diplomacy to war.

I believe these 14 troops would not have been killed. I believe we wouldn't have spent tens of billions of dollars pursuing an unnecessary war with an additional pricetag of probably hundreds of billions of dollars to replenish our munitions stock and repair infrastructure that has been damaged.

And I also believe that Americans would not have had to pay more than \$50 billion extra at the gas pump since the war began on February 28. Those are arguments I have made often on the floor that I don't intend to repeat today.

But the argument that I want to make today is about why this timing for the War Powers Resolution is sort of propitious, why this timing makes this vote different than the vote that we had 2 weeks or 4 weeks ago or 8 weeks ago.

We are in day 100-plus of this war, but I am happy that President Trump has announced a cease-fire and a potential deal to be signed and revealed on Friday. Now, I don't know exactly what is in the deal, but I believe an off-ramp to a war that never should have been started is a good thing.

We will have the opportunity to debate the deal once we know more details about it, but taking an off-ramp to a war that should never have been started is a positive.

What this off-ramp means is, I would say, we are in an intermission. We don't exactly know what the second

act will be. We don't know if the intermission will hold. We don't know if the parties will comply with their obligations.

We are hearing that the deal may well be a partial deal that would, for example, reopen the Strait of Hormuz and end the blockade on Iranian ports and stop the back-and-forth bombardment between the United States and Iran and other actors in the region.

But we are also being told there will be some components to the deal that will not be done, and then we will enter into a longer term discussion, for example, about all of the important details regarding Iran's nuclear program.

So let's just say we are in an intermission, and we don't know how long the intermission will be. I think the fact that we are in an intermission is the perfect time to vote for a War Powers Resolution, specifying, we should not restart a war against Iran without the consultation with Congress that should have started before the war was begun.

Why restart a war and risk more lives of our kids? Why restart a war and risk more damage to American families and their pocketbooks? Why restart a war and risk more damage to the global economy? Why restart a war and risk more dollars coming out of the U.S. Treasury that will have to be paid by the U.S. taxpayers?

An intermission is a great time to do what we should have done before this war, which is have the consultation with Congress that the Constitution requires. Why restart a war if we haven't done our job?

There is also a second reason that is really related to the first reason that makes this a particularly propitious time to vote yes on Senator WARNOCK's resolution. We know that the United States and Iran are engaged in a negotiation, and they are trading proposals back and forth.

I would think that my colleagues in the Senate would want to see and understand the details of those proposals and reach their own conclusion about whether a deal is a good deal or a bad deal.

If President Trump reaches an agreement with Iran that touches upon any aspect of the Iranian nuclear program, the President is obligated to submit that to Congress under a bill that I offered many years ago, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, and Congress would have a chance to look at any deal dealing with Iran's nuclear program in deciding whether it was a good deal or a bad deal.

But what if President Trump decides: I am not entering into a deal because I think it is a bad deal, and we need to go back to war? Should we allow President Trump the unilateral ability to make a decision that a deal is a bad deal, and we need to go back to war?

Under the INARA act, the President has to submit any proposed deal to Congress, but he doesn't have to submit his refusal to enter into a deal to

Congress. We might have our own judgment about whether a deal was good enough or insufficient.

I mean, I could foresee a circumstance where President Trump might say: We have had this negotiation. Iran has not made enough commitments. So we are not going to agree, and we are going to end the intermission and go back to war.

But the Senate might have a different opinion. We might look at a deal that the President doesn't find sufficient and say: It is not perfect. We wish it were better. But it is far superior to going back to war and risking the lives of more of our troops or spending tens of billions of dollars.

And the only way that we can guarantee that we would have an opportunity to weigh in on whether a deal—hey, it, actually, though not perfect, is better than going back to war—is if we pass a resolution, saying: You cannot restart this war without getting congressional approval.

I have listened very carefully to my colleagues who have been voting against the War Powers Resolutions. They have all kinds of reasons. I don't question their reasons.

Some believe, for example, that the President has unilateral ability to wage military action for about 60 days pursuant to the War Powers Act. And so, some were voting against War Powers Resolutions during the first 60 days. But I think at least four have joined and now decided to vote for War Powers Resolutions since day 60 passed.

But I have also heard some colleagues say, sincerely: I don't want to vote for a War Powers Resolution while the United States is engaged in military action against Iran because it might be sending a message to troops that they are not being supported. And even though they are troubled by the war and even though they are troubled about being after day 60, they don't want to send a message that would undercut U.S. troops that are engaged in military action at the very moment.

OK. If that is the case—and I understand that argument, I understand it—then this would be a time when we are in the intermission where you could vote for a War Powers Resolution without undercutting any action that is currently underway involving U.S. troops.

So my hope is that my colleagues will take advantage of the fact that we are in this intermission, an intermission of undetermined length, to do what the Constitution demands that we do and insist that we not restart a damaging war against Iran without Congress weighing in and voting on it.

For that reason, I will support Senator WARNOCK's resolution and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I am going to be very brief on this as I have

given this speech I can't remember how many times before as the other side has attempted to help Iran and bring these resolutions forth that would stop the President from pushing back against Iran and the terrible things that they have done.

Specifically, on this one, like the others, this is what they are asking Congress to vote for. The operative language says:

[C]ongress hereby directs the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against [Iran].

Well, there are a number of problems with this. First of all, the United States Armed Forces are not engaged in hostilities within or against Iran. They have been, but it has been over for some time. So there is not—it directs the President to do nothing in that respect because it is impossible to do something that is not going on—stop something that isn't going on.

But more importantly, I think, as we go forward with this, it is widely reported that an agreement has been reached between Iran and the administration, which is going to be signed here in the next few days.

If a miracle happened—a miracle happened—and this passed, got through the Senate, got through the House, and the President signed it, if that miracle happened, do you think Iran would sign the deal that has been negotiated? Of course not.

So, once again, what do we have? Nobody on this planet wanting to help Iran except for the 47 people on this side of the aisle. China is not helping. Russia is not helping. North Korea is not helping. Cuba is not helping. Venezuela is not helping. None of the autocracies, bad countries on this planet are helping. But you have 47 people here who are trying to help the Iranians.

So I was mistaken. When the war started, I came out on this floor, and I said in closing: Iran, nobody is coming to help you.

I was wrong. One entity is coming to help, and it is these 47 people over here. But the good news is, this is not going to pass. It is not well-taken. It is something that can't possibly happen because it is not going on. If it did happen, it would give tremendous aid and comfort to our enemy.

I would sincerely urge all Members of this body to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

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. WARNOCK. Madam President, I rise today to ask a simple question. After 109 days of a failed war and now a fragile, temporary—but welcome—truce, will my Republican colleagues