

these bills is not on the substance, and my objection is not an objection forever. So I appreciate when my colleagues have offered to join me in this effort to push leadership of both parties of the committees in both Houses to convene and create that process that isn't just going to be a fair consideration of my proposals or their proposals but all the proposals that come from the Senate through the Natural Resources Committee; give them a shot for consideration on the House side and proper consideration for signature by the President of the United States.

My colleague from Alaska, not just as a member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee but her leadership on the Committee of Indian Affairs—not all public lands bills involve Indian Country, but many, indeed, do, including some of mine that have been in the pipeline—I appreciate her willingness to bring her authority and role in her caucus to bear in this effort and conversation.

My colleague from the State of Nevada, not just a member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee but a member of the leadership team on the Democratic side here in the Senate, I appreciate her willingness to bring her authority and power to bear in advancing this conversation.

So, for today, I shall not object on these two bills but reiterate my frustration and am glad to be joined by two additional colleagues in trying to push, again, leadership on both sides of the aisle, not just the Senate committees but the House committees, to establish a fair way forward for all Members and all of our proposals.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2815) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The bill (H.R. 972) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to thank not only the Senator from California but my colleague Senator CORTEZ MASTO from Nevada as we have worked through this.

Know that the Senator from California does have my commitment to try to address not only the matters that are on your specific docket today but, again, to try and find a better path forward for all the legislation that means so much to so many of us in our communities. And I thank you for the courtesy today.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a matter that will likely be before the body next week, a vote on my bipartisan War Powers Resolution to advance the proposition we shouldn't be at war against Iran without a vote of Congress.

I want to take a few minutes today to put this in a context that we may all be discussing a little more next week. I believe very strongly that a war with Iran today is both unnecessary and dangerous. I want to spend a little bit of time talking about why we are at this moment right now where President Trump, as recently as Tuesday night at the State of the Union, is suggesting that we may possibly need to be at war with the Nation of Iran.

The history of relations between the United States and Iran from the beginning of the 20th century to now is very, very tragic. The United States and Iran were generally allies from the turn of the 1900s until the early 1950s.

In the middle of World War II, at the Tehran Conference, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Leader Stalin basically devised what would be the boundaries of the current-day Iran. That has essentially stuck.

Iran's prehistory was very complicated, and the United States earned really good—significant good will from the Iranian people, from the Iranian Government being involved in that discussion.

We continued being seen as a real ally of Iran. In the early 1950s, after having had essentially a dictatorship or monarchy, Iran elected a popular Prime Minister. The British Government was worried about that government—the Iranian Government's efforts to potentially nationalize British oil assets.

So the British Government tried to talk the United States into a military action to topple the Government of Iran. The United States refused and convinced Britain not to do it. But later in 1953, the United States and Britain together arranged—and these are basic facts, no supposition, no opinion here—the United States and Britain joined in an effort to foment a coup d'etat that toppled the popularly elected Government of Iran and installed Reza Pahlavi as the Shah of Iran over the objections of the Iranian people.

We did that. Britain did that.

The United States then funded the training of a secret police operation in Iran, the SAVAK, that between 1953 and 1979 perpetrated gross human rights abuses against the Iranian people.

This is a history that is not that well known to Americans, but a history that is very well known to Iranians.

That dictatorship and the human rights abuses perpetrated by the SAVAK and the Pahlavi regime eventually led to an uprising in Iran in 1979, and Ayatollah Khomeini, another opposition leader, toppled the Pahlavi regime and took control of the Iranian Government.

Most Americans remember that Iranian protestors stormed the U.S. Embassy, took 52 hostages in that Embassy, and held them for 440-plus days. It was not as a result of the change in regime, but there was an additional fact.

After the regime changed, the Shah of Iran sought to come to the United States for refuge and medical treatment. The State Department urged President Carter not to allow it on the grounds they were trying to at least maintain some positive future relationship with the Iranian Government, but the United States allowed the Shah of Iran to come into the United States for medical treatment and care, and that led Iranian protestors to attack the American Embassy.

That was a horrible, unlawful act, and the hostages held for 440 days were treated very, very badly. But that then led to a series of back-and-forths between the United States and Iran.

The United States, in the 1980s, funded Iraq in an 8-year war against Iran that cost hundreds of thousands of Iranian lives. The United States supplied military assets to Iraq, to Saddam Hussein, to carry out war against Iran. We transferred military assets, including chemical weapons, to Saddam Hussein that were used against the Iranian population.

The Iranian population grew to have a deep distrust and fear and even hatred of the United States because of this toppling of the Prime Minister through U.S. funding of a war against Iran.

During this Iran-Iraq war, the USS *Vincennes*, a Navy ship, accidentally shot down an Iranian airliner in the region, killing more than 250 Iranian civilians. It was an accident, but Iran didn't believe it was an accident because they knew that the United States was funding Iraq in the war against it, and they viewed that attack on their civilian aircraft as something they could not countenance.

As this was happening, then-Iran-funded Shia militias and terrorist groups bombed the Marine barracks in Beirut in the early 1980s as the Iran-Iraq war was going on and the United States was funding the war against Iran. This back-and-forth started to escalate.

Later, as you all know, the United States invaded Iran's two neighbors—to the west, Iraq; to the east, Afghanistan—and put U.S. troops all around Iran in its neighborhood. Iran interpreted those invasions as a piece of the toppling of their government and the downing of the commercial aircraft and the funding of the Iraq war.

And so, by the time we get into the 2000s, the depth of enmity between the United States and Iran was so intense, the Iranian regime chants "Death to America" because of this history. And we were friends just 60 or 70 years ago. We took a fundamental turn in the relationship and opened the path for a potential new chapter in United States-Iranian relationships when, during the Obama administration, the United States, European allies and China and Russia joined together to negotiate with Iran to curb their nuclear program.

I wrote a piece of legislation, the Iran Nuclear Review Act, that led to a

vote on the floor of the Senate on a diplomatic treaty with Iran to curb their nuclear program.

The diplomatic treaty, on the first page, in the first paragraph, in the first sentence, had this declaration: Iran reaffirms it will never seek to purchase, acquire, or develop a nuclear weapon.

And the agreement contained other provisions limiting for many years Iranian centrifuge production, Iranian enhancement of uranium. It compelled significant inspections of the Iranian facilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

This deal was a solid deal that, for the first time in 60 years, actually had us around the table with a party that had grown to be an enemy, together with other allies but also adversaries, like Russia and China, to control Iran's nuclear program.

Many of you know that in President Trump's first term, over the objection and advice of his first Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and his first Secretary of Defense James Mattis, told President Trump: Please maintain the JCPOA. Please maintain the agreement that curtails Iran's nuclear program and use U.S. sanctions against other Iranian behavior; bad actions in the region, human rights violations, development of missile programs. The JCPOA allowed the United States and other nations to use sanctions to punish Iran for nonnuclear activity.

President Trump's team told him keep the deal in place and use the sanctions against some of these other bad behaviors.

Contrary to the advice of these seasoned foreign policy professionals, seasoned defense professionals, Donald Trump tore up the JCPOA, and the United States walked away from it, even though our allies said it was working, even though China and Russia said it was working, and even though the International Atomic Energy Agency said that it was working.

The consequences of abandoning that deal were very obvious at the time. If the United States walked away from a deal that was working, so would Iran. And so they began again to enhance the enrichment of uranium. They began again to produce centrifuges. They ceased allowing the intrusive inspections that had been a component of the JCPOA.

But that wasn't the only effect of President Trump abandoning the deal. The parties around the table—our allies who had worked with us on it—couldn't believe that the United States was walking away from diplomacy. It weakened trust with our allies, and maybe more importantly, we had China and Russia—two of our great adversaries today—at the table with us to make sure there was not a nuclear Iran. And by walking away from the deal, we further poisoned relationships with those nations that now pose such challenge to the United States.

There was an additional consequence. We were in the middle of negotiating

with North Korea about limits to their nuclear program. As soon as they saw the United States abandon a deal that was working, they stopped negotiating with us over limits to their nuclear program.

Why would we do a deal with the United States if the United States will back out of it? And there has been no real and meaningful progress about the denuclearization of North Korea since the United States decided to pull the plug on the JCPOA.

So here is where we are today. We have an armada around Iran. The President has said multiple times—and when he says it, you have to believe it because he bombed Iran in the summer—that he is potentially on the verge of going to war with Iran.

What does it mean to have the armada? Let me use a Virginia example. The USS *Ford* carrier is now positioned near Iran to be used in the case of an attack.

Carrier deployments—and the USS *Ford* deploys out of Virginia, thousands of sailors—carrier deployments last about 7 months. The carrier was in the Middle East. President Trump ordered the *Ford* to go to the Caribbean—to be a show of force around Venezuela before it steamed to the Caribbean. Now the President has ordered the *Ford* back to the Middle East.

A normal deployment for a carrier is 7 months. This is a deployment that is now going to be 11 months long. Our sailors who thought they were going to be home seeing their families for Christmas—it is now going to take 11 months. It will be the longest deployment of any carrier since the Vietnam war, and our sailors are just ready to be home.

The problems with the *Ford* are almost ones that I don't want to talk about on the floor. Many of the toilets on the *Ford* are inoperable. These are the kinds of things that happen during a deployment, and that is why you limit a deployment to certain months. You get the ship back in port, and you fix it up. The *Ford* is in tough shape right now and needs to come back to port so that the sailors can see their families, but also the quality of life and morale on the *Ford* are in dramatic decline.

So we are at a precipice, with U.S. military troops arrayed around Iran.

I just want to say this: War is unnecessary, and war is dangerous. Then I will conclude.

War is unnecessary.

The President says we may need to go against Iran to stop their nuclear program. We had stopped it through diplomacy. Do we really prefer war to diplomacy? And President Trump, in the bombing of Iran in the summer—you will remember he said we had obliterated the Iranian nuclear program. Well, if that was true 6 months ago, there is no need for us to invade Iran now to stop their nuclear ambitions.

The President said we may need to go to war against Iran to protect the pro-

testers. There are protesters against dictatorial governments all over the world. Are we going to put our sons and daughters in harm's way against those nations to protect protesters?

I have to say I don't really accept that the President is that worried about Iranian protesters. Why not? The President is currently deporting people to Iran—Iranians who were in the United States who do not have appropriate immigration status, even Iranian Christians, even Iranian dissidents who would be subject to persecution if they were returned to Iran. President Trump has now sent more than 100 of them back to Iran. If he really cared about the rights of Iranians and how they would be treated by their government, he wouldn't be doing that.

Finally, the President has said Iran has ballistic missiles. They do, but the U.S. overmatch to Iran's military is so dramatic that any effort by the Iranians to use missiles—and there has been no evidence that that is their intent against the United States unless we use missiles against them—we would obliterate that capacity in an instant were they to use it.

War is unnecessary.

War is dangerous. War is dangerous for U.S. troops.

We have put troops all around Iran, all around its borders in Lebanon, in Israel, in Syria, in Iraq. We not only have troops, we have consulates, for example, in Erbil, in the Kurdish section of northern Iraq.

U.S. assets are everywhere. We can do a great job of protecting an awful lot of territory, but it would not be hard for even an overmatched nation like Iran, if they are attacked, to reach out and do harm to the U.S. troops or U.S. consulates or U.S. civilians. And for what?

This is dangerous to U.S. troops, and I say this as a father of a U.S. marine and representing a State that is one of the most military States in the Nation.

War is dangerous to the region.

When the United States has believed it could change regimes before in Iraq, in Afghanistan, in Libya, what has it gotten us? What has it gotten us? Has it created a more stable region? Hardly. Hardly.

To think that we could go in at the barrel of a gun and invade a nation and guarantee that lives lost or injured in that would be worth it because we would be producing something would be making a prediction about the Middle East that has not been borne out by events in the last 25 years.

War is dangerous to broader diplomacy.

We had the nations of the world, both our friends in Europe and China and Russia, around the table, and we broke a diplomatic deal, and it would suggest that we are preferring war to diplomacy. Why would nations want to engage in diplomacy with us if they can't trust the United States to stick to our word?

Finally, war is dangerous to the U.S. economy.

An invasion of Iran would immediately lead to dramatic increases in the price of oil. American citizens, Virginians, are already laboring under costs that are too high for energy, for health, for groceries, for building supplies. The last thing we need is an unnecessary war that will drive energy prices even higher.

War also risks inciting other dictators.

If the United States can decide, well, we are going to invade a sovereign nation because we want to do it, what is our ability to stand and justly criticize Vladimir Putin and Russia for invading Ukraine? What argument can we have to China to suggest that they shouldn't incur upon and invade Taiwan?

The United States should uphold a moral standard so that we can look others in the eye and say: You should uphold a moral standard.

We would badly degrade our ability to prevent dictators from invading other sovereign nations if we are to get into a war with Iran.

Look, Iran is not a good guy. Iran is a bad guy. Iran punishes protesters. Iran is engaged in all kinds of activity in the region—funding terrorist groups in Syria, in Iraq, Hezbollah in Lebanon, Hamas in Gaza, the Houthis in Yemen. They are doing that. They are doing that at the expense of their own people.

Iran engages in activities far away from the Middle East. They have had to remove their Ambassadors from nations as far-flung as Morocco and Australia because of activities that are designed in those countries to destabilize them. Iran funded a bombing of a Jewish cultural center in Argentina a couple decades ago, and they still haven't been held to account.

So they are not a good guy; they are a bad guy. But are they worth wasting U.S. lives, U.S. money, U.S. credibility over? Let's use other tools, like sanctions, and not use our own kids' lives to deal with this threat.

I will conclude and just say this: My time as Governor from 2006 to 2010 coincided with the mass deployment of Virginians into wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. As the Governor of Virginia, I had an authority over members of the Virginia National Guard. The Virginia National Guard deployed in the thousands to Iraq and Afghanistan, and I went to the deployments, and I went to the homecomings, and I went to the wakes, and I went to the funerals.

Some of these are too emotional for me to describe on the floor, but in an odd way, one of the most emotional was the day that I went to the Virginia War Memorial to watch a homecoming. U.S. troops coming out of Afghanistan had landed in a base in New Jersey, and they had hopped on a bus to come back to Virginia to reunite with their families. They exited the bus. They got in formation, and their commander announced that this National Guard unit was now returned all present and accounted for.

I knew that commander. He had been a Richmond police officer, and he was deployed with his unit. I saw in his face that for that entire 6-month deployment, he labored under the incredible strain of wanting to be able to say those words at the end of the deployment—"all present and accounted for."

I saw him say those words, and I saw the care and the tension and the fear melt away. It made me think of the other homecomings I had been to where the commander couldn't say those words, and it made me think about them and what they had labored under.

I made a vow when I came to this body that I would do everything in my power to fight tooth and nail against sending our sons and daughters into unnecessary wars. I am on the Armed Services Committee. I voted for war authorizations. If we need to go to war to defend this country, then those who have signed up to do that, knowing that that might be a possibility, they are ready to serve us to defend the Nation. But an optional war at the whim of a President—ordering troops here and there around the globe as if they are a palace guard—for no articulated rationale puts our kids at risk in a completely unacceptable way.

We will have a vote next week on something that I believe is just bedrock constitutional law. We shouldn't be at war without a vote of Congress. We shouldn't be at war with Iran unless Members of this body have the guts to have a debate and vote and put their thumbprint on it and say: This is in the national interest.

No shortcuts. No end runs around Congress. No end runs around debate in front of the American people and laying out the stakes for them.

I can't believe that Virginia, one of the most military States in the country, is so different than other parts of this Nation. I can't believe that this Nation is itching for another war in the Middle East. Haven't we learned something from a quarter of a century of war in the Middle East? I hope we have.

I hope my colleagues will join me next week in suggesting no war unless we vote to authorize it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of what should be a given. It is already law, common sense—a bill that supports this country and our citizens.

I rise today to, in fact, speak on behalf of American citizens and in support of the rule of law, and I rise to say that we have to pass without delay the SAVE America Act. This would require ID to vote.

This is something where the vast majority of Americans agree—Democrats, Independents, and Republicans. The vast majority agree this should become law. According to the Pew Research

Center, that is about 83 percent of Americans that are in support of ID to vote. Breaking that down into groups, 76 percent of Black Americans support this idea, and 82 percent of Hispanic Americans support this idea. These are all groups that the Democrats claim this measure would harm.

So my Democratic colleagues—coming up with excuse after excuse after excuse, which I suspect is just distraction from why they are really opposing this—my Democratic colleagues continue to block this reform, and they place partisan politics above the clear will of the American people.

The United States of America, which will celebrate its 250th anniversary this year—indeed, this great American experiment—hinges on the sanctity and integrity of our elections. We must protect this institution and safeguard our democracy by ensuring that only Americans are allowed to participate in American elections.

This just makes sense. If you need a valid ID to drive, to buy alcohol, to check into a hotel, why would you not need an ID to vote? In fact, even the mayor of NYC is now requiring people to provide IDs to take part in their snow-shoveling program. Yet they say it is unreasonable to expect Americans to provide one at the ballot box.

Retaining election integrity should not be a partisan issue; it is foundational to our self-government. The SAVE America Act upholds the rule of law. It makes sure there are stronger protections in place across the country to ensure that only citizens can participate in our elections.

When voters trust the system, participation increases. Secure elections will strengthen democracy. Ben Franklin famously replied to a bystander after the Constitutional Convention that we have a Republic if we can keep it. We must preserve our elections to preserve our Republic, and that is why it is so important that we pass the SAVE America Act.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MOODY. I ask unanimous consent that the rollcall vote begin immediately.

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

#### VOTE ON MCCORMACK NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the McCormack nomination?

Mrs. MOODY. 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 executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE), the Senator from