

how it would be reported. In fact, if there were a close vote on it, as I anticipate there will be, the way it would be reported would be as “even a handful of Republicans and virtually every Democrat voted to send the President a message of ‘we don’t want you using Armed Forces in wars against Iran.’” That is how it would be reported. That is how they would read it. It would only reinforce this belief among some in that regime that they can go further than they actually can.

I don’t mean to say this to argue that there are Members of this body here who are deliberately putting the men and women of our Armed Forces in danger. I am telling them I don’t know if they have thought through that part of it. What we do here and how it is perceived in other parts of the world, especially in a reclusive organization such as the regime in Iran, are often two very different things.

The danger with this amendment is that it is going to confirm to several hard-liners in that regime that the President is constrained, that America’s President will not be able to respond, and that they will be able to get away with more than they actually will get away with.

In some ways, ironically, I believe that even a big vote on this—but, certainly, the passage of it—increases the chance of war. I say that because, if they miscalculate and they read into this an opportunity to attack at a higher level without taking a retaliatory response, they are going to do it. Then they are going to be wrong, and then the retaliation will come. Then it is on. Then we can’t predict what will happen next.

What happens next is terrifying to even contemplate because what happens next could be a Hezbollah strike against Israel and Israel’s responding 10 times stronger. It could be Hezbollah’s moving to abduct, kill, murder American diplomats or personnel inside of Lebanon; it could be Shia militias throughout Iraq and Syria attacking U.S. personnel; it could be increased Houthi attacks not just into Saudi Arabia but potentially even hitting civilian populations and Saudi Arabia’s responding back. What could come next is a spiraling series of events that could lead to a dangerous regional war. That is not an exaggeration. Neither is it an exaggeration to believe that a miscalculation on the part of Iran and what it can get away with would trigger that.

This is an unnecessary amendment because, if you accept the War Powers Resolution as valid under our Constitution—I do not—it already reads that the President has a right to respond in self-defense. The administration has made it very clear that this is the only way it intends to use it. It has made it abundantly clear. In fact, its force posture proves it. If you look at what we have in the region—the number of ships and the number of people—we are not postured for an invasion or an all-

out war. We are postured for defensive operations and retaliatory strikes to an attack, and that is what the administration says it intends to do.

What it intends to do is to continue forward, strangling the sources of financing that the Iranian regime is using to sponsor terrorism and its ballistic missile program and having enough force in the region to protect our men and women who serve us if they were to come under attack. The President is allowed to do that in the Constitution and in the War Powers Resolution.

All this amendment does is create a dangerous opportunity to be misread and to cause Iran to do something, and that will trigger a response. Then we will have a war. For those who are considering still voting for this because they want to reassert Congress’s role, this is the wrong time and place in which to do it.

I will close with this. I don’t agree with all of the President’s foreign policy views. I can tell you, for example, that I do believe that openly talking about getting out of the Middle East as soon as possible has emboldened some of this thinking that America is constrained and that we really don’t have the dedication or the commitment to see this through if we are attacked. Yet, in fairness, this President is far less likely to get into a war or to start one than was his predecessor—or his two predecessors, actually. He showed great restraint the other day.

It strikes me that not only is this unnecessary from a policy perspective, it is also unnecessary from a personality perspective. This is not a President who is looking to start wars. This is a President who is looking to get out of the ones we are already in. Again, I just don’t know why we would run the risk of putting something out there that could be misconstrued and lead to an attack when we have a President who has no intention of starting a war, when we have a military posture in the region that would not support an offensive military operation or anything close to what Afghanistan or Iraq was like, and when we have this danger of miscalculation.

The amendment has been filed, and there will be a vote on it tomorrow. I just hope that the handful of people still thinking about it will consider all of these points.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwith-

standing the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to Commissions, Committees, Boards, Conferences, or Interparliamentary Conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two houses, or by order of the Senate.

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

EXTENDING THE PROGRAM OF BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES AND RELATED PROGRAMS THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2940.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2940) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through September 30, 2019.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2940) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

PROVIDING FOR A 2-WEEK EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2047, submitted today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2047) to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.