

the discussions with the international community.

In regard to Iran, Mr. Pompeo would isolate us from our European allies, but in regard to withdrawing from the Paris climate talks, he would isolate America from every other nation in the world. We would be the only nation not a part of that discussion. Let me remind my colleagues that the commitments made in Paris are only enforceable by us. There is no international enforcement mechanism.

Words matter. A top diplomat needs to engage a very diverse global community. Mr. Pompeo's words unfortunately make it very challenging for him to be able to have the confidence of the international community.

He associated American Muslims with terrorism by stating that their perceived silence in condemning attacks "has made these Islamic leaders across America potentially complicit." I know that after each of the horrible terrorist activities we have seen in America, Muslim leaders in Maryland and Muslim leaders around the world have stood up and said that they condemn in the strongest possible terms those terrorist acts.

That should have no space. Unfortunately, those types of comments give space to those who are promoting a form of nationalism that allows for hate-mongering, and that cannot be tolerated in our country.

The LGBTQ community is rightly concerned. I go to Mr. Pompeo citing verbatim the following passage from a sermon castrating members of the LGBTQ community.

America has worshipped other gods and called it multiculturalism. We have endorsed perversion and called it an alternative lifestyle.

That type of language should have no place for someone who wants to be the top diplomat of America.

So I have come to the conclusion, based upon the necessity of the Secretary of State to engage the national community, to provide leadership and the use of diplomacy, that based upon those—my priorities, policy priorities, not politics or partisanship—that I cannot support Mr. Pompeo for Secretary of State.

I want to conclude with this. I have had the chance to lead the Democrats on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I have been a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee my entire 12 years in this institution. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee and its leaders have had a long tradition of bipartisanship, of recognizing the independent role of the legislative branch and the critical role played by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and we are always stronger when we act in unity.

That is a tradition of our committee. I want to just point out that I don't question anyone's motives on how they vote on the nominee for the Secretary of State, but I have great confidence that we in the Senate Foreign Rela-

tions Committee will continue the great tradition we have established as an independent voice and as a voice that tries to work in unity in the best interest of our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, it was an honor for me to speak in front of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this month in support of my Kansas friend and colleague, Mike Pompeo, as the President's nominee for Secretary of State. I come to the floor to urge all of my colleagues, despite the previous remarks, to vote in favor of this uniquely qualified nominee in such a vital role in our administration's Cabinet.

The point I would like to make, as we go into the very important topics we have to discuss on an international basis, is that we need Mike Pompeo, and we need him now.

As our Nation's most senior diplomat, Mike, I know, will be forthright, will be forceful and thoughtful and, yes, he will be diplomatic. He will give the President and the Congress very candid counsel. He is a man of his word.

Now, I say all of this because I think I, at least, have the credentials to know Mike and to know who he is and what he is about because I have known him for more than a decade, first as a friend and a business leader, then as a congressional colleague, and most recently as a leader of our intelligence community. We had some long talks before he accepted that offer by the President, and I thought he was very well suited.

Mike will represent American ideals and values backed by the strength of leadership of the free world—yes, the free world and the allies that have been referred to by my colleagues across the aisle. The point is, whenever there is a void, the world pays a price. That is why we need Mike, and that is why we need him now.

I am going to again urge all of my colleagues—all of those who voted in support of his intelligence post last year and those who now have the opportunity to support this extremely qualified candidate—to vote yes and to send our senior diplomat to work on the many challenges that face our Nation.

NOMINATIONS AND THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Madam President, now, let me talk a little bit about bipartisanship and what I have stated with regard to my friend and colleague, the minority leader. I have encouraging news. We met yesterday in the Rules Committee and voted to reduce postcloture debate from 30 hours to 8 hours for certain nominations. I am not sure we have the 60 votes to pass that, but it is something at least we are moving toward with regard to the problem of having 86 cloture votes and delaying the time; that is, 3 months, by the way, with re-

gard to time lost that we could have been working on other issues.

We still have to consider this change to the rules on the Senate floor, but in the course of our debate, the minority whip, Senator DURBIN, who is an appropriator par excellence, has supported Chairman SHELBY's commitment to do all 12 appropriations bills—how long, how long, how long has it been since we have done appropriations bills and voted on amendments on appropriations bills?

The leadership has apparently decided to recommend that we actually return to being a Senate voting on amendments. Many Senators, as I said earlier, do not even know what it is like to serve in a functioning Senate. They hardly know what it is like to operate under regular order, where bills are referred to committee, amended, brought to the floor, debated, amended, and then passed when appropriations bills were on time. Goodness knows we need to get back to that.

Members of the Appropriations Committee, without this agreement—prior to this agreement—were standing on the sidelines, wounded cardinals, if you will, with a shrinking slice of the discretionary pie. So thank you to the minority whip and thank you to the leadership on both sides for our efforts to get back to regular order.

Now you can take one step further and vote for Mike Pompeo, a qualified and honorable candidate to serve as Secretary of State. Most of the statements I have heard—I have not paid too much attention to the colloquy on the floor or the statements on the floor—but people who have reservations have a "while I" speech: while I understand his qualifications, while I understand he has a great background, first in his class at West Point, and while I, and while I, and while I.

Then, there is the catch: But then, on the other hand, I have some concerns. Most of the concerns are in regard to whether Mike Pompeo can be diplomatic. I know him. He can be forceful—sometimes he can be a little stubborn, but he can be forceful. He is well qualified for the job and, yes, he can be diplomatic.

So I hope we can take this step toward a bipartisan Senate and take one further vote and vote for Mike Pompeo, who is certainly qualified. I say that because the cloth of comity in this Senate is pretty threadbare. We have a situation where we need to return to a sense of comity and at least some bipartisanship. Certainly, it would be also to set aside personal and partisan concerns and vote for Mr. Pompeo.

As I said again, we have a void right now. We have a good man to be Secretary of State. I urge my colleagues to vote yes, and let's put a few threads back into the cloth of comity in the Senate and recommit to being the world's greatest deliberative body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I rise to express my strong opposition to President Trump's nomination of Mike Pompeo to be the next Secretary of State. There are many reasons to oppose this nomination, but the main reason for me is pretty straightforward. Mike Pompeo is completely unfit to serve as America's chief diplomat.

During his time as a public servant, Mike Pompeo has embraced a variety of views that betray America's values. Whether it is his support for interrogation techniques that amount to torture, his preference for war over diplomatic solutions, or his hateful, blatantly discriminatory views about Muslim and LGBTQ Americans, Mike Pompeo's confirmation would degrade America's diplomacy and erode our moral standing on the world stage.

Let's start with his evolving position on torture. In 2014, then-Congressman Pompeo praised the interrogators who used torture as "patriots" and "heroes," but when seeking confirmation to become CIA Director, Mr. Pompeo suddenly said he would "always comply with the law" prohibiting torture.

When asked if he would comply with a request from the President to use torture, he said he couldn't "imagine being asked to do so." Never mind that as a candidate Donald Trump boasted about his desire to bring back waterboarding and "a hell of a lot worse." In his later written answers, Mr. Pompeo suggested he could support bringing back waterboarding and other torture techniques if he thought they were necessary.

So, first, Mike Pompeo was for torture, but when he wanted to be CIA Director, he miraculously changed his position. Now he thinks the United States should reserve the right to torture people in the future. This position undermines our core values as Americans, and that alone should disqualify him from being America's Secretary of State, but there is more.

Mike Pompeo's hawkish views could quite literally lead us into another war. Just look at his views on Iran. The Iranian Government is a bad actor, no doubt about it. That is why the Iran nuclear deal was so important. It is easier to counter Iran's bad behavior if it has no nuclear weapons than it would be to keep Iran in check if it could threaten the region and threaten the world with a nuclear bomb.

The deal with Iran imposed strong limits and intrusive inspections on Iran's nuclear program so it cannot develop a nuclear weapon, and our intelligence community tells us it is working. That is very important to the security of our allies and the security of the whole world.

The Iran nuclear deal is a negotiated solution designed to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, and it was accomplished without resorting to military action. The deal is the product of putting diplomacy first. That is good for the security of the United

States, good for our allies, and good for the world.

Mike Pompeo doesn't seem to understand that. He has called the Iran nuclear deal a "surrender," and he has said the United States should walk away. Pompeo has even publicly contemplated regime change. How can we expect countries to trust America's word when our chief diplomat believes we have the right to break our word and violate international agreements at any moment?

Think for a minute about what it would mean for negotiating any deal with North Korea about their nuclear weapons if Mr. Pompeo is in charge. He said we can tear up our agreement with Iran, even though they have followed through on their part, just because Mr. Trump and Mr. Pompeo have decided they don't like it. Who would negotiate with a United States that has so little respect for the standing of its promises? I cannot in good faith vote in favor of Mr. Pompeo for the reasons I have outlined, but there is another reason I cannot vote for him, one that is deeply personal to me.

Shortly after the Boston Marathon attack, then-Congressman Pompeo accused Muslim leaders of being silent about the bombing and even said they were potentially complicit in the attack. After the marathon bombings, all of Boston grieved together, including our Muslim leaders. Our Muslim communities helped Massachusetts emerge stronger and more united. To suggest otherwise is insulting to the Boston Marathon bombing victims and to our Muslim American brothers and sisters. When he was shown to be wrong, Mike Pompeo refused to apologize. His comments were ignorant, offensive, and just plain wrong. They certainly aren't the words of someone who is fit to be America's chief diplomat.

But there is more. Mike Pompeo's longstanding attacks on the LGBTQ community also make him unfit to serve as Secretary of State. He supported legislation in Congress to allow States not to recognize equal marriage, and he relied on financial contributions from hateful groups like the Family Research Council. His public record paints a deeply disturbing world view.

The risk posed by this nomination is magnified because Mike Pompeo would be teaming up with John Bolton, President Trump's new National Security Advisor. John Bolton has never met a war he didn't like, and Mike Pompeo supported Bolton's disastrous Iraq War. Together, Mike Pompeo and John Bolton will fan the flames of war in President Trump's foreign policy because they both embrace military solutions first.

I hope that, if confirmed, Mr. Pompeo will take real steps to prioritize diplomacy, to improve morale at the State Department, and to fill key diplomatic positions that have been vacant for far too long. But at a time when we are facing enormous global challenges, the State Department needs a leader who

will put diplomacy first to solve problems and to protect our national security. Mike Pompeo is not that leader. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise to oppose the nomination of CIA Director Mike Pompeo to be the Secretary of State.

I voted against confirming Mike Pompeo to be the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency because he lacked the experience and the qualifications for the position. His time at the CIA has done nothing to ensure me that he now has the capabilities to lead the State Department.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, Mike Pompeo made repeated discriminatory remarks about Muslim Americans. He has argued that the Muslim American leaders have a "special obligation" to denounce terrorist attacks, and he has falsely claimed that they have failed to do that. I am proud to represent dynamic Muslim and Arab-American communities in Michigan. I have seen that these patriotic communities are often the first to denounce senseless acts of violence that pervert the Islamic faith.

Mike Pompeo also has close ties to a group that is a Southern Poverty Law Center "designated hate group" because of its anti-Muslim rhetoric and conspiracy theories. I seriously question the judgment of an elected official who would work with such a group, and I do not believe it shows the type of character required in an individual who is nominated to be our country's top diplomat. How can someone with this attitude work effectively with our allies and partners in the Middle East? I don't think he can.

Mr. Pompeo has also supported bringing back waterboarding and other torture measures that do nothing to keep America safe and go against our Nation's core values. We now have a President who has said that he believes that torture "absolutely" works.

We can do better than this. America is better than this. I voted to ban the use of waterboarding and other so-called enhanced interrogation measures because they do not work, and in fact, they violate basic human rights, undermine our Nation's counterterrorism missions, and place our own servicemembers at risk.

Confirming a Secretary of State that has condoned torture is just another step in our Nation's current retreat from being what President Ronald Reagan called "a shining city on the hill."

I am concerned that Mike Pompeo will also continue the United States' retreat from a leadership role in addressing climate change—an existential moral and economic issue that will impact our planet for generations to come. Director Pompeo has criticized the Paris climate agreement and has

made statements that contradict the overwhelming scientific events on climate change.

Our Nation faces serious global challenges: Russian aggression, North Korea's nuclear weapons program, instability in the Middle East, and China's ongoing efforts to expand their power and influence. The world is looking to the United States for leadership. This is a time when skill and experienced diplomacy is essential to advance our interests and our values on the world stage. I do not believe that Director Pompeo has the necessary experience, diplomatic skills, and values required to be the Secretary of State. I will oppose his nomination this afternoon.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

NOMINATION OF RICHARD GRENELL

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, in addition to the nomination of the Secretary of State, later today we are considering the nomination of Richard Grenell to be our Ambassador to Germany. I opposed Mr. Grenell's nomination in committee, and I will again oppose his nomination today.

If confirmed, Mr. Grenell will assume the post at a time of strain in the bilateral relationship since the election of President Trump, who has disagreed with German Chancellor Angela Merkel on several key issues.

Germany is one of our most critical partners and a key ally in upholding the post-World War II order responsible for securing peace and prosperity. Germany is a key NATO ally, serving with distinction and sacrifice in Afghanistan. Germany also serves on the frontlines of Europe against an aggressive Russia that is actively seeking to destabilize German democracy in the same way it does American democracy. Germany showed great humanity in accepting so many migrants when that crisis escalated in 2015.

This is a close ally for our security but, more importantly, an ally in championing the values we hold dear as a country. It would have been my hope and desire that for such an important ally as Germany, the President would have put forth a serious, credible, experienced diplomat who could strengthen our relationship with Germany. Instead, President Trump nominated Mr. Grenell.

In a few moments, I will read things that Mr. Grenell has tweeted in the past and that he continues to tweet, even as his nomination has been pending before this body. I do not savor having to read you these tweets because, frankly, I don't think they are suitable to have to say on the floor of the Senate.

But since the majority and the President have prioritized this nominee and the vote will occur a little later, the American people deserve to know exactly who the Trump administration wants to represent the United States to our great friend and ally Germany. So I will read a selection of Mr. Grenell's tweets for the RECORD:

"Did you notice that while Michelle Obama is working out on the Biggest Loser, she is sweating on the East Room's carpet?"

Rachel Maddow should "take a breath and put on a necklace."

He said this about Callista Gingrich: "Callista stands there like she is wife #1."

He said in another quote: "Do you think Callista's hair snaps on?"

This is just a selection—just a selection. I chose not to read some that I consider the most insulting out of respect for this body.

These are not the words of a child or a teenager who does not understand the power of words; these are the words of a grown adult who had previously been a public face of the Bush administration for 8 years. Mr. Grenell's derogatory comments about women are simply unacceptable for anyone to make in public, let alone a diplomat.

I would go further. Not only do these tweets show bad judgment, they show us who Mr. Grenell really is and how comfortable he is publicly contributing his own brand of toxic political discourse. Will he do such things if he is confirmed and goes to Germany? Will he insult via his Twitter account the female Chancellor of Germany? I don't know. I hope not.

In the committee process of considering his nomination, Mr. Grenell was asked about these tweets and other comments he has made. Do you know what he said? He assured us that he understood there was a difference between being a private citizen and being a public figure and that he would never say or tweet such things as a public figure. So imagine our surprise when Mr. Grenell started tweeting again after he had been voted out of the committee. Astonishingly, he retweeted a WikiLeaks tweet which included documents stolen by Russian intelligence.

Madam President, the other nominee before us today, CIA Director Mike Pompeo, has called WikiLeaks "a non-state hostile intelligence service." That is what CIA Director Mike Pompeo called WikiLeaks—"a non-state hostile intelligence service." He went on to say about WikiLeaks that it will "take down America any way they can and find any willing partner to achieve that end."

Imagine that. Amidst all the controversy about the connection between WikiLeaks and Russia and their interference in our 2016 election and while under consideration for an ambassadorship by this body, Mr. Grenell feels perfectly comfortable tweeting out emails stolen by Russian intelligence to interfere in our democratic process—basically, in essence, as Mike Pompeo describes, doing the work of Russian intelligence.

These are not the actions of a person with anything close to good judgment. These are not the actions of a diplomat. I urge my colleagues to reject sending Mr. Grenell to Germany as a U.N. Ambassador.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I did not vote for Rex Tillerson to be Secretary of State. Although Mr. Tillerson was a successful corporate executive, I did not believe that heading the world's largest oil company was the right resume for the Nation's top diplomat. Mr. Tillerson is a man of substantial intellect who wanted to do the right thing, but his record as Secretary of State speaks for itself. He did not do well, and the country, the State Department, and its employees—including some of our most experienced diplomats who felt they were no longer relevant—paid a substantial price.

For that reason, it is imperative that the next Secretary of State has the qualities and professional track record to restore the preeminent role that the Department has traditionally played in U.S. foreign policy.

It is also for that reason that today I intend to vote against the nomination of CIA Director Mike Pompeo to be Secretary of State.

By all accounts, Mr. Pompeo, like Mr. Tillerson, is a man of substantial intellect, and my conversations with him have seemed to confirm that. As we have learned, that alone is not enough to qualify one for a job that should be filled by someone who has proven that he or she understands and is skilled in the art of diplomacy and whose beliefs are consistent with fundamental American values. As the country's top diplomat, the Secretary of State should be a vocal and persuasive advocate for diplomacy to avoid conflict and crises. Unfortunately, I believe Mr. Pompeo's record falls far short.

Mike Pompeo has made no secret of his strong support for President Trump, whose saber rattling, provocations, and so-called America First policies would more accurately be described as "America Alone." The President has called for drastic cuts in the State Department's budget and personnel that would sharply diminish its role in diplomacy and development. He would weaken international organizations and alliances that serve our interests and undermine U.S. global leadership at a time when China and our other competitors are seeking every opportunity to expand their global reach. Unlike Secretary of Defense Mattis who, in response to the White House's proposed cuts, has been a strong advocate for the State Department's mission and budget, I am not aware that Mr. Pompeo ever publicly expressed a view either way until his confirmation hearing.

Mr. Pompeo supported the invasion of Iraq, and he has defended the use of torture, two of the most profoundly misguided foreign policy decisions since the Vietnam war. As far as I know, it was not until this week, when his nomination was in jeopardy, that he said the Iraq war that he had long defended was a mistake, a mistake that claimed the lives of thousands of