

WAR IN IRAN

SENATE VOTES TO LIMIT TRUMP'S WAR POWERS



JACK GRUBER, USA TODAY NETWORK

Sen. Bill Cassidy, R-La., questions Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. on Sept. 4 as he testifies about the health care agenda in front of the Senate Committee on Finance in Washington.

Several key GOP senators didn't take part or defected

ZACHARY SCHERMELE
USA Today
AND HUMEYRA PAMUK
Reuters

WASHINGTON — In a political blow to President Donald Trump, the Senate moved forward for the first time Tuesday with a measure to end the war in Iran.

After several key Republican senators didn't vote — and another key GOP bloc defected — the war powers resolution advanced 50-47.

Though the vote was largely procedural, and faces an uphill battle to actually becoming law, the resolution's progress was a bad omen for the White House about potentially waning support in Congress for the war.

Rising gas prices, spiking inflation and the president's sinking polling numbers have become political liabilities for battleground GOP lawmakers as the November midterm elections approach.

Louisiana Republican Sen. Bill Cassidy — who lost his primary reelection just days ago in large part because Trump crusaded against him — voted to advance the war powers resolution. Before his reelection

loss, Cassidy opposed the measure several times.

Virginia Sen. Tim Kaine, who led Democrats' legislative campaign to end the Iran war, said ahead of the vote that the Trump administration is "well past the 60-day deadline" for a president to legally engage in military hostilities abroad without congressional authorization.

"The administration is unwilling to show us the legal rationale for the war," he said on the Senate floor ahead of the vote. "That should be a flashing red light."

Path forward

Meanwhile, Trump said earlier Tuesday the United States might need to attack Iran again, and that he was only an hour away from deciding on a strike before he postponed the attack.

Trump spoke to reporters at the White House a day after saying he paused a planned resumption of attacks following a new peace proposal by Tehran.

"I was an hour away from making the decision to go today," Trump said on Tuesday.

Iran's leaders are begging for a deal, he

claimed, adding that a new U.S. attack would happen in coming days if no agreement was reached.

"Well, I mean, I'm saying two or three days, maybe Friday, Saturday, Sunday, something, maybe early next week, a limited period of time, because we can't let them have a new nuclear weapon."

Speaking to reporters at a White House briefing, Vice President JD Vance said Washington and Tehran made a lot of progress in their talks and neither side wanted to see a resumption of the military campaign.

In Tehran, Ebrahim Azizi, head of the Iranian parliament's national security committee, said on social media that pausing an attack was due to Trump's realization that any move against Iran would mean "facing a decisive military response."

Iranian state media said Tehran's latest peace proposal involves ending hostilities on all fronts including Lebanon, the exit of U.S. forces from areas close to Iran, and reparations for destruction caused by the U.S.-Israeli attacks.

Please see **IRAN**, Page A2

Lawsuit over ICE detainers must stay with Wisconsin Supreme Court

KIMBERLY WETHAL
kwethal@madison.com

A lawsuit questioning whether Wisconsin county sheriffs are allowed to detain people for federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement must stay with the state Supreme Court, a federal judge ruled Friday.

The ruling comes after the five sheriffs named as defendants attempted to move the case to federal court, claiming the liberal-controlled Supreme Court has no jurisdiction to hear the case. U.S. District Judge William Conley rejected the effort Friday, stating that the defendants missed the 30-day window to bring the lawsuit to federal court after it was filed in September and shouldn't have waited until December after the Supreme Court indicated it would consider the case.

"Because respondents waited to file their notice of removal some 103 days after service of the petition — well outside the 30 days permitted under (state statute) and

"Hopefully, we are closer to the day when local sheriffs and police can no longer detain innocent immigrants without cause until ICE comes to arrest and deport them."

Christine Neuman-Ortiz, Voces de la Frontera executive director

only after learning that the Wisconsin Supreme Court found the petition's merits worthy of consideration — respondents' notice of removal was untimely, and this case must be remanded to that court," Conley wrote.

In a statement, the plaintiffs, American Civil Liberties Union and immigrant rights group Voces de la Frontera, celebrated the ruling's return to the Supreme Court, where

justices will consider whether a handful of Wisconsin county sheriffs are violating immigrants' civil rights by detaining them in their jails on behalf of ICE.

"Hopefully, we are closer to the day when local sheriffs and police can no longer detain innocent immigrants without cause until ICE comes to arrest and deport them," Voces de la Frontera Executive Director Christine Neuman-Ortiz said in a statement.

The lawsuit argues that when county sheriffs detain people for immigration offenses after any holds for state law violations expire, that constitutes a new arrest, which state law does not allow them to make.

State law expressly prohibits local law enforcement from making civil arrests except for in narrow cases, the lawsuit states.

The five sheriffs named in the lawsuit are Dave Gerber of Walworth County; Todd Delain of Brown County; Chad Billeb

of Marathon County; David Zoerner of Kenosha County; and Chip Meister of Sauk County.

Honoring an ICE detainer means the sheriff agrees to hold the person for 48 hours after they otherwise should have been released under state law. The goal of detainers is to give ICE agents more time to pick someone up if they are suspected of being in the country illegally.

The ACLU wants the Wisconsin Supreme Court to prohibit sheriffs from holding people on ICE detainers, which are based on administrative warrants. Holding someone for extra time must be authorized by a judicial warrant, in which a court determines there is probable cause to keep them longer, the ACLU argues in the lawsuit.

In the original filing from September, the ACLU said county sheriffs in Wisconsin had received more than 700 voluntary detainer requests and just under 250 people had been detained.