

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

choose today to finally stand up to this President? Will my colleagues say "enough is enough" to the President who ran as a candidate promising no new wars?

After 109 days of contradictory messaging, rampant and rank corruption, with people literally cashing in on news about this war and devastating news stories from the Middle East, will this be the vote when my colleagues finally stand up for their constituents, rather than simply standing up for Donald Trump?

Here we are: Tens of billions, if not hundreds of billions, of American taxpayer dollars spent; gas prices are well over \$4 a gallon; hard-working American families crushed under tens of billions of dollars in soaring energy prices and inflation driven by this unnecessary war; and the ultimate price—the ultimate price—13 servicemembers tragically killed.

The question is, Where did all of that land us? What did it accomplish? And it appears that we are basically back at the status quo, at best.

Let me start by saying that I am very proud of our military. That is not the question here. We have the most powerful, the most effective military force in human history.

The problem is that the President has decided to use that military force and significantly deplete our defense arsenal for his own pet projects. He decided to launch an attack on Iran to decapitate the brutal leadership of an awful regime, but he had no plans for what he would do the next day—the next day.

And so, today, the regime is still in place, with younger and potentially more hard-lined and radical leadership.

So even now, with the war hopefully coming to an end, I still don't understand why we were in this war in the first place.

It appears that the only thing this war has done is put servicemembers' lives at risk, Americans in the region at risk. It has undermined our global standing and put millions of civilians in harm's way.

And so we pray for the families of the brave Americans who have already paid the ultimate sacrifice, our servicemembers who are the best among us and who go no matter who the President is or what their politics are. They were simply following orders. Our servicemembers embody courage and patriotism. They put it on the line for us, and I submit that they deserve better than this.

We have learned, due in part to recent history, that it is easier to get into a war than it is to get out. The President said on multiple occasions: "It will all work out well in the end. It always does."

Maybe it always does for him, but we are sending brave American servicemembers into battle, and they return with visible and invisible wounds of war.

This is something not to be handled in a cavalier manner. It is the most sa-

cred responsibility of an American President.

And so I promised my people of Georgia that I would walk with them even as I worked for them. I have listened to agonizing stories of war from veterans whose lives will never be the same. I have stood at Dover Air Force Base to receive the bodies of Georgia's heroes. I have looked into the grief-stricken eyes of their family members as they greeted a flag-draped coffin wrapped in unbearable grief. It is gut-wrenching, and it is something that I think about whenever we consider the consequences of sending our servicemembers into harm's way.

The question is, Did the President think about it? Did he think about those families, even as he said, "It will all just work out. . . . It always does"?

I am hopeful that this war may come to an end beginning this week. But let's be clear: This temporary truce agreement with Iran brings us back to the status quo, at best.

Let's not forget that the President of the United States, in deciding to launch this war, created a situation in which we lost our servicemembers.

We continue to grieve the dozens of fathers in Iran who will be without their school-aged daughters on Father's Day, as an elementary school in Minab was attacked on the first day—or a bomb was dropped on that school the first day—a horrific mistake with huge human consequences. And this was on day one of the war—young children who didn't get a chance to grow up, hundreds of dreams that will never be realized.

Those Iranian babies are human beings. They too are children of God. And so this kind of consequential action requires much more thought, a much more serious-minded administration than what we have seen over the last year and a half.

And so I hope that we are seeing the beginning of the end of this war. But we paid a huge cost, and I am not so sure what we are getting for that.

But the question before this body is, Will this President do this again? I think the answer is yes. He will continue to choose bombs over diplomacy because he is a failed warmonger, and that is why I am urging my colleagues to speak up in this moral moment and send a message that the President should not feel that he can easily and so cavalierly use American might while Congress stands idly by.

The time is always right to do what is right.

I urge my colleagues to do what your constituents are begging you to do and join me in putting a check on this President's lawless warmongering—warmongering that has upended the global economy and sent gas prices soaring.

The Strait of Hormuz is closed. Iran perhaps seems even more emboldened to try it again. And what is the plan to ensure Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon with Iran going into this truce with all of its enriched uranium?

We had a deal. Donald Trump chose war over diplomacy.

Hopefully, this Congress will stand up and do its job. The time is always right to do what is right. That time is now.

Pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1546a and in accordance with 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. 172.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 172, a joint resolution 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.

Mr. WARNOCK. I know of no further debate.

#### VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Leg.]

#### YEAS—47

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

#### NAYS—48

Armstrong	Daines	Lee
Banks	Ernst	Lummis
Barrasso	Fetterman	Marshall
Blackburn	Fischer	McCormick
Boozman	Graham	Moody
Britt	Grassley	Moran
Budd	Hagerty	Moreno
Capito	Hoeben	Ricketts
Cornyn	Husted	Risch
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cramer	Johnson	Schmitt
Crapo	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Curtis	Lankford	Sheehy

Sullivan Thune	Tillis Tuberville	Wicker Young
NOT VOTING—5		
Bennet Booker	Hawley McConnell	Sanders

The motion was rejected.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from Florida.

**CONDEMNING THE DICTATOR OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, XI JINPING, FOR DECEIT, UNDERMINING PROSPECTS FOR PEACE AND SECURITY, AND ORCHESTRATING CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY**

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today and ask the Senate to pass my resolution, S. Res. 444, a resolution condemning the dictator and General Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Xi Jinping.

There is no greater threat to America's way of life and peace and prosperity in the world than Xi Jinping and the CCP. Xi Jinping hates us. Communist China wants to destroy us. He is not a partner. He is not a competitor. He is a brutal dictator leading a criminal organization that lies, cheats, steals, exploits slave labor, and commits genocide and crimes against humanity on an industrial scale.

Don't take my word for it. Let's look at what he has done. He and his Communist Party lied about the origins of COVID, and they keep lying about it. They used the World Health Organization to spread lies while over a million Americans died. And their incompetent and malicious response to COVID isn't the only way communist China killed Americans.

Their unwillingness for years to completely curb the export of fentanyl precursors is directly responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of our fellow citizens.

Where communist China hasn't killed, it cheated. For decades, they have cheated on trade, causing millions of Americans to lose their jobs.

Communist China's currency manipulation continues to threaten our economy and destabilize the world global order, as well as their hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of intellectual property theft.

They don't treat other countries any better. In one egregious case last year, in the African nation of Zambia, communist China dumped toxic waste into Zambia's main river, poisoning the drinking water of 5 million innocent people. It also destroyed the livelihoods of up to 12 million people. It was intentional. They knew what would happen, and they did it anyway because they don't care.

I have not seen a peep of outrage from the international community. Rather than help, communist China coerced the Zambians into signing non-disclosure agreements, offering them next to nothing in cash in exchange for never talking about it.

That story of how communist China literally destroyed an entire country

overnight should tell everyone exactly who we are dealing with. As the Zambian Government hopefully learned, with friends like communist China, who needs enemies.

It is clear that Beijing doesn't care about the damage they inflict on others, and, of course, we know that Xi Jinping and his goons couldn't care less about their own people either. In Xinjiang, Xi's communist China is committing a horrific genocide against the Uighur people, putting over a million innocent Uighurs in camps and forcing women to share beds with Han Chinese men sent by the state.

They harvest organs from political dissidents, including the Falun Gong. And in one case mentioned in the State Department's 2022 Country Report on Tibet, the CCP literally beat a Tibetan man to death for the crime of delivering food to a home for the elderly.

Communist China apparently saw a basic act of charity as an attack on the state's inability to take care of its own people, a task they repeatedly fail at. But Xi isn't above physically attacking and beating his own people. Just look at what happened in Hong Kong in the summer of 2020.

Six years later, they continue to unjustly imprison my friend Jimmy Lai. We will never stop fighting for his release.

The CCP doesn't care about cooperation or respect. They constantly attack anyone they don't agree with, including our allies in the Philippines and Taiwan.

They fly thousands of their military jets in Taiwan's airspace, utilize slave labor in their distant water fleet, and prop up terrorists and dictators from North Korea to Iran, to the Taliban.

The CCP, especially under Xi Jinping's tyranny, has a particular brand of evil. They seek to control the world, and in their mind that means destroying anyone who stands in their way, whether it is their own people or not.

We cannot be afraid to stand up to our enemies and hold the line for the next generation of Americans. The numerous policy mistakes we made in the last few decades, including the idea that if only every Chinese citizen could get an F-150 and a Coke, they would eventually abandon their communist system and become more like us.

Instead, the opposite has happened, where we have literally subsidized the CCP's military modernization, economic development, genocide, and crimes against humanity.

Despite everything Communist China has done to our Nation and to the world, we continue to invest over a trillion dollars into Chinese companies listed on our exchanges, to include newly designated Chinese military companies like Alibaba.

I hope that no one who cares about human rights and confronting our Nation's foremost enemy would prevent this resolution's passage. We cannot afford to abandon our responsibility to

our people and to the world to denounce the evil agenda of the Chinese Communist Party. I hope my colleagues will join me in that effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 444.

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

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 444) condemning the dictator of the People's Republic of China, Xi Jinping, for deceit, undermining prospects for peace and security, and orchestrating crimes against humanity.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 444) was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 9, 2025, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

**21ST CENTURY ROAD TO HOUSING ACT**

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, America is in a full-blown housing crisis. Across this country, home prices are sky high, rent is through the roof, and the median age of a first-time home buyer is now at an alltime high. But for too long, the Federal Government has been asleep at the switch, and that changes today.

I stand here in support of the historic 21st Century ROAD to Housing Act. This landmark bill will boost housing supply, bring down costs, and, for the first time ever, stop private equity from buying up single-family homes.

Yes, we are about to do it—pass the biggest housing bill in more than 30 years.

This bill has more than 45 total housing provisions designed to help increase housing supply and bring down costs. Here are just a few of the things that this housing bill will do.

It removes regulatory barriers and streamlines environmental reviews to speed up affordable housing development and to speed up the construction process.

It rewards communities that build more housing, and it prods those that