

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

American soldiers and sowed chaos in the Middle East. The fact that he has insisted that waterboarding is not torture and, by implication, acceptable should by itself be disqualifying for the job of Secretary of State.

He has supported keeping open the Guantanamo detention facility, arguing that detainees “should stay right where they are” and that the facility “is the right place for [detainees] from both a security and legal perspective.” That is as wrong as it is disturbing. The indefinite detention without trial of detainees at Guantanamo contradicts our most basic principles of justice, degrades our international standing, and harms our national security. Mr. Pompeo’s position is particularly troubling, given the President’s expressed intent to send new prisoners to Guantanamo for the first time in more than a decade.

Mr. Pompeo has opposed what he called the “disastrous” Iran nuclear agreement, and he appears to favor withdrawing from it despite the International Atomic Energy Agency’s determination that Iran is in compliance and support for the agreement from a wide spectrum of diplomatic, scientific, and national security experts. As far as I am aware, he has offered no realistic alternative, and the consequence would be to isolate the United States from our closest allies and to risk Iran restarting its centrifuges and quickly obtaining a nuclear weapon.

During the negotiations to halt Iran’s nuclear program, Mr. Pompeo supported military strikes against Iran’s nuclear facilities, reportedly arguing that it would take “under 2,000 sorties to destroy the Iranian nuclear capacity,” which he described as “not an insurmountable task for the coalition forces.” It might not be insurmountable, except for the fact that it would be the end of the coalition since few, if any, of our partners would join us. Beyond that, the unilateral use of preemptive military force on that scale in a volatile region in which Russia has its own security interests could ignite a regional war with far-reaching, possibly catastrophic, consequences.

While the world’s scientists overwhelmingly warn of the long-term dangers of climate change, Mr. Pompeo is an unabashed climate change sceptic. He has said that the Paris Climate Agreement, which is supported by practically every country including China, amounted to “bowing down to radical environmentalists.” That is extremist rhetoric about what many believe to be the most serious challenge facing our planet, a challenge that can only be met through diplomacy, and it belies a disturbing intolerance for opposing views.

Mr. Pompeo has accused American Muslim leaders of being “potentially complicit” in acts of terrorism that they do not specifically condemn. He has said that Muslims “abhor Christians” and that they “will continue to press against us until we make sure

that we pray and stand and fight and make sure that we know that Jesus Christ is our savior and is truly the only solution for our world.” It would be hard to think of a more effective way to alienate the Muslim community, without whose help we cannot effectively counter violent extremism.

As a Member of Congress, Mr. Pompeo cosponsored legislation to ban all refugee admissions, regardless of country of origin, even though people seeking safety are already subjected to a rigorous vetting process. It should alarm each of us that the nominee to oversee the bureau charged with protecting refugees, migrants, and other vulnerable people uprooted by conflict—a tradition we take pride in—would take such a crass, ideological approach to our country’s refugee admissions policies.

Mr. Pompeo has suggested that the Federal Government should collect records of American citizens’ communications, without warrants and in bulk, and combine them with “publicly available financial and lifestyle information into a comprehensive, searchable database.” Think about that, at a time when the public is already outraged by Facebook’s and Cambridge Analytica’s misuse of personal data.

As a Member of Congress, Mr. Pompeo criticized President Obama for going to Cuba, accusing him of making “unilateral concessions.” It is true that the restoration of diplomatic relations with Cuba—which was overwhelmingly supported by the people of both countries—did not include an agreement by the Cuban Government to hold free and fair elections, nor to stop persecuting opponents of the government. No one who knows Cuba expected that. But if free and fair elections and respect for human rights are Mr. Pompeo’s prerequisite for having an embassy and an ambassador in a foreign country, we will need to close a lot more embassies than the one in Havana.

We could begin with our embassies in China and Russia, Saudi Arabia and Egypt would be next, then Jordan and Morocco, Honduras, Vietnam—the list goes on. The fact is we need embassies staffed with qualified personnel, including in countries whose governments we disagree with, so our diplomats can work to protect our interests and the interests of Americans who travel, study, work, or serve there. That is diplomacy 101.

Mr. Pompeo opposes LGBT rights and has no record of defending civil society activists and independent journalists who risk their lives speaking out against corruption and abuses of human rights by foreign security forces, particularly in countries we consider friends or allies. He has also worked against women’s reproductive rights, including cosponsoring radical legislation that would make abortion illegal nationwide, even in cases of rape. He voted to defund Planned Parenthood and for the “global gag rule,”

which prevents foreign nongovernmental organizations from receiving U.S. funds if they use their own money to provide safe abortions or even information about abortion services in their country.

I take no pleasure in opposing Mr. Pompeo’s nomination. I wish I could vote for him, as I am the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of State and Foreign Operations. I strongly support the State Department, its mission, its personnel, and its programs. I have consistently defended its budget when others here or in the White House sought to cut it.

I am pleased that Mr. Pompeo has said he wants to fill the vacant senior leadership positions at the State Department and that he recognizes that the United States has a duty to “lead the calls for democracy, prosperity, and human rights around the world.” But his record in Congress and his staunchly ideological views raise grave concerns about the policy direction he would give to those senior leaders. Given his record and beliefs, there is little reason to believe that he will be an effective or consistent defender of democracy and human rights abroad, particularly in the face of President Trump’s abandonment of those values and principles.

In many other respects, Mr. Pompeo’s testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee had all the characteristics of a “confirmation conversion,” when he contradicted many of his previous statements and positions. As Senator MENENDEZ asked, Which Pompeo are we voting for? The job of Secretary of State is too important, especially with Donald Trump in the Oval Office, to roll the dice and discount everything Mr. Pompeo has said in the past.

If Mr. Pompeo is confirmed, as it appears he will be, I will make every effort to work with him to advance our foreign policy and national security interests, as I did with Secretary Tillerson after opposing his nomination, but given the impulsive and reckless statements and actions of this President and the upheaval at the State Department during the past year, we need a Secretary with the necessary temperament, values, and long-standing commitment to diplomacy and development. I hope he proves me wrong, but today I do not believe we have that in this nominee.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today in opposition to the nomination of Mike Pompeo to be our next Secretary of State.

After considering his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, his work as Director of the CIA, and his record as a Congressman, I believe he doesn’t possess the skillset necessary to be our country’s top diplomat.

The Secretary of State must be well-versed in the art of diplomacy. They must possess a deft touch necessary to

operate on the world stage. Unfortunately, Mr. Pompeo's record and his rhetoric show how ill matched he is for this position.

Above all, I fear that he would only reinforce President Trump's worst impulses to lash out at our adversaries rather than pursue dogged diplomacy. This is particularly concerning when it comes to Iran. The Iran nuclear agreement is the strongest nonproliferation agreement ever negotiated. It blocks Iran from ever obtaining a nuclear weapon, protecting our security and the security of our partners in the region. By all reports, it appears President Trump is set on walking away from the Iran nuclear agreement next month, even though Iran continues to abide by its strict terms.

If confirmed, I don't believe Mr. Pompeo would even try to walk the President back from that foolish decision. Instead, he would most likely feed the President's desire to leave, not because of its merits, but simply because it was negotiated by President Obama.

To be clear, if the United States abandons the agreement, we will do so on our own. Our international partners—including the United Kingdom, France and Germany—have said they will remain in the agreement so long as Iran complies with it. To date, the IAEA inspectors and our own intelligence community have all said that Iran remains in full compliance. When the nuclear agreement was signed, Iran was less than a year away from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Today, all of Iran's paths to a weapon—the plutonium, uranium and covert—are blocked. The fact that today Iran cannot obtain a nuclear bomb is in spite of Mr. Pompeo's efforts.

During the negotiations leading up to the agreement, then-Congressman Pompeo not only called for the United States to abandon diplomatic efforts, he encouraged us to attack Iran. He said, "It is under 2,000 sorties to destroy the Iranian nuclear capacity. This is not an insurmountable task for the coalition forces."

During his recent confirmation hearing, he was unable to source that claim or name which other nations would have joined our coalition. That is an especially perplexing position since our strongest allies were all negotiating alongside the United States at the time.

After the nuclear agreement came into effect, Mr. Pompeo continued his campaign by sending the Supreme Leader a highly provocative letter. He taunted Tehran, asking for a visa to inspect Iran's nuclear facilities, monitor their elections, and receive a briefing on their ballistic missile programs. His publicity stunt only served to further inflame tensions between our countries.

Finally, shortly after our elections and the day before he was nominated to be the Director of the CIA, he tweeted: "I look forward to rolling back this disastrous deal with the

world's largest state sponsor of terrorism."

When asked about his position during his confirmation hearing, Mr. Pompeo instead simply discounted the real and dangerous possibility that Iran would restart its nuclear weapons program if we abandon the agreement. I see no reason to believe his misinformed views have changed in the past year.

As troubling as Mr. Pompeo's hostile view toward Iran is, I am equally concerned by his divisive remarks about minority groups within the United States. Following the Boston Marathon bombings, Mr. Pompeo falsely suggested Muslim Americans were complicit in the attacks. The following year, he characterized U.S. counterterrorism efforts as a struggle between Islam and Christianity.

After the Supreme Court's landmark ruling legalizing same-sex marriage, Mr. Pompeo said the court's opinion was a "shocking abuse of power" that "flies in the face of . . . our Constitution." He has also claimed that the "ideal" family has a father and mother, a shockingly outdated view of families here in the United States and around the world.

Finally, the State Department plays a leading role in providing family planning assistance abroad. Under Mr. Pompeo, I fear the State Department will retreat from providing this vital assistance.

As a Member of the House, Mr. Pompeo repeatedly cosponsored legislation to limit a woman's right to choose. Specifically, he supported bills to make abortion illegal nationwide, even in the case of rape.

He also repeatedly supported the "global gag rule," known as the Mexico City policy, which restricts U.S. funds to any foreign health clinic that provides abortion services, even if it is legal in that country.

All too often, rape is considered a weapon of war. Our global health programming should not be restricted in a manner that ignores this ugly reality.

The Secretary of State is charged with representing America's values to the world and must be committed to exhausting all means of diplomacy to avoid conflict. I don't believe Mr. Pompeo can do that and shouldn't be confirmed as Secretary of State.

Therefore, I will vote no, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I would like to address the nomination of Director Pompeo to be the next Secretary of State. I intend to vote against this nomination, and I would like to explain how I reached this conclusion.

This was a difficult decision. I supported Director Pompeo's nomination to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Director Pompeo is a talented individual who has spent his life in public service, but the job of Secretary of State requires different skill sets and experiences than that of Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

As such, the Senate has a constitutional responsibility to review Director Pompeo's qualifications anew with respect to this specific nomination. As I indicated, the role of the Secretary of State is significantly different from that of the CIA Director. The question before us is whether Director Pompeo has the right background, judgment, and independence to faithfully execute the duties of America's top diplomat. Using those criteria, I have to oppose this nomination.

One of the first tasks for the next Secretary of State will be to rebuild the capabilities and morale of the Department of State. Over the last year and a half, the Department has struggled with widespread vacancies, drastic proposed budget cuts, a Foreign Service treated with contempt by the White House, and a failed reorganization effort under Secretary Tillerson. The result has been the hemorrhaging of decades of foreign policy expertise, the demoralization of those who continue to serve at State, and the marginalization of diplomacy as an instrument of national power.

I question whether Director Pompeo is right for the task of reversing the damage wrought at the State Department. During his time in the House, then-Congressman Pompeo was a staunch supporter of Tea Party proposals to slash the very State Department programs that are critical for advancing our foreign policy and national security interests. During his confirmation hearing earlier this month, Director Pompeo declared his commitment to end the "demoralizing" vacancies at the State Department and strengthen the diplomatic corps. Even if Director Pompeo has had a late conversion on the road to his nomination for Secretary of State, it is not clear whether he will be any more successful than Secretary Tillerson was in gaining White House approval for his desired candidates for senior positions or convincing this President to listen to the advice of our experts at Foggy Bottom.

My deeper concern is whether Director Pompeo is the right choice to carry out the Secretary of State's role as the lead advocate for diplomacy as a means of advancing our national interests.

The need for effective diplomacy to solve our most pressing security challenges has never been greater. Today's national security threats are complex, including the reemergence of near-peer competitors Russia and China who seek to undermine the rules-based international order, regional challenges from rogue regimes in North Korea and Iran, and the continuing threat from violent extremist groups that seek to exploit ungoverned spaces to spread their destructive ideologies. Such challenges to our national security require a comprehensive strategy that coordinates military and nonmilitary tools of national power.

I am concerned that President Trump's bellicose rhetoric and budgetary priorities indicate a predisposition for choosing military action over diplomatic solutions. Since September 11, we have asked our men and women in uniform to go above and beyond in addressing security and stability challenges globally, and they have responded magnificently. As we face expanding threats below the level of armed conflict and insecurity arising from regional destabilization, we need an increased focus on nonmilitary tools and diplomacy to prevent or mitigate these challenges. The next Secretary of State needs to be an effective counterpart for Defense Secretary Mattis in finding diplomatic solutions to the complex crises we face in Syria, the Middle East, North Africa, the South China Sea, and North Korea.

Based on his record, I am not convinced that Director Pompeo will serve as the strong voice for diplomacy that our military and our country need to counter these pressing threats. Time and again, Director Pompeo has chosen to reject negotiations and call for the use of force. His track record calls into question his ability to be an effective advocate for diplomatic solutions that are in U.S. national interests.

With regard to the nuclear deal with Iran, known as the joint comprehensive plan of action, or JCPOA, Director Pompeo has called for "rolling back" this multilateral agreement that was carefully negotiated alongside the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China. Director Pompeo's opposition to the Iran nuclear deal runs counter to views of Defense Secretary Mattis and most senior military leadership. As a congressman, Director Pompeo sought to undermine negotiations with Iran and advocated for military airstrikes to destroy its nuclear program. During his confirmation hearing, Director Pompeo indicated that he would not push back against President Trump's reckless impulse to withdraw from the JCPOA in mid-May, saying instead that he would "recommend to the President that we do our level best to work with our allies to achieve a better outcome and a better deal." This response is in spite of the fact that, by all accounts, the JCPOA is working as intended and Iran is verifiably meeting its commitments under the deal.

Withdrawal from the Iran nuclear deal would also have a profoundly harmful effect on our nuclear negotiations with North Korea. North Korea has little reason to engage with us in a serious dialogue if it suspects that we may later withdraw unilaterally from any agreement without cause. During the Trump administration, the risk of conflict with North Korea has increased to unprecedented levels, and the diplomatic preparations over the coming weeks will be critical to the success of President Trump's upcoming summit with the North Korean leader. However, should that summit fail to

produce meaningful constraints on North Korea's nuclear ambitions, I am concerned that the administration will use this failure as a pretext for pivoting to a preemptive strike against North Korea, and I am not confident that Director Pompeo will be effective in urging restraint by President Trump in opposing military action while seeking to redouble efforts to find a negotiated solution.

Perhaps the most difficult role of any Secretary of State is being an independent voice willing to say no to the President. I recognize that some say that one of Director Pompeo's highest qualifications for Secretary of State is his close relationship with the President because foreign leaders will know that, when Director Pompeo speaks, he has the backing of President Trump. Director Pompeo's alleged "rapport" with President Trump raises concerns that he will only tell the President what the President wants to hear and will not provide objective, nuanced policy recommendations based on U.S. foreign policy interests. I believe we are already seeing this dynamic with respect to the JCPOA.

Unfortunately, we have seen this scenario before. Early in the George W. Bush administration, the President surrounded himself with like-minded advisers who were predisposed to distorting the intelligence on Iraq, and, as a result, they failed to present nuanced policy options on the march to war against Saddam Hussein. I am concerned that we will find, in hindsight, that Director Pompeo's closeness to President Trump will prove less an asset and more a shared blind spot that will lead to simplistic policy recommendations, an unwillingness to stand up to the President when he is wrong, and an indulgence of the President's impulsive preference for strategy-free displays of military force.

The President needs a top diplomat who will provide independent foreign policy recommendations, will press to exhaust all possible diplomatic avenues for the safety of our military and citizens, and will boldly represent our core American values. While I believe that Director Pompeo is an honorable and decent man, who has provided life-long service to our country, he is not the right nominee for Secretary of State at this time. As such, I will oppose Director Pompeo's nomination for Secretary of State.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the nomination of Mike Pompeo for Secretary of State.

After closely reviewing Mr. Pompeo's record and past statements, I have concluded that he is not the right person to serve as Secretary of State. While I respect him and will work closely with him, I cannot support his nomination.

The world continues to look to America for our leadership on diplomacy and bringing our allies together. That includes upholding international agreements, such as the Paris accord, which Mr. Pompeo has opposed. It also in-

cludes respect for people of different ethnic and religious backgrounds, and Mr. Pompeo's past statements about Muslims and immigrants greatly concern me.

While I voted in favor of confirming Mr. Pompeo to be the Director of the CIA and thank him for his service, Secretary of State is a different job with different responsibilities.

Thank you.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise in support of the President's nomination of Director Mike Pompeo to serve as Secretary of State.

Director Pompeo has a very long record of public service which has prepared him for this very important position. Let's start at the beginning.

Director Pompeo was top of his class at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and he served honorably in the U.S. Army. He is also a graduate of Harvard Law School. In Congress, Director Pompeo was a leader on issues of national security and foreign relations. Finally, and most recently, as Director of the CIA, Director Pompeo has been a successful leader of the world's best intelligence professionals who work to resolve some of our Nation's most sensitive and difficult problems.

I have heard on the floor of the Senate recently a number of my colleagues who have called into question whether he should serve as our Nation's top diplomat. He has served in the military. He has served as Director of the CIA. What I want to do is go back to the time he spent at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

I wish to remind the body that in the military, we serve in many missions, but one of them does include diplomacy. As the Presiding Officer understands, as military members—whether a marine or a soldier—oftentimes during conflicts you stand shoulder-to-shoulder with members of other countries. You must have an understanding of the cultural effects and the cultural differences between our nations, and you work to resolve problems. Whether with the indigenous population or whether it is within the military ranks, we serve as diplomats.

At West Point, I know Director Pompeo learned this lesson very well. Many of us—whether you go through a military academy or whether you are going through a Reserve Officer Training Corps Program at a university like I did at Iowa State—you learn about what we call the instruments of national power. Those instruments of national power are called DIME. It is an acronym, D-I-M-E.

D stands for diplomacy. We learn that, again, as members of the military and as officers in our Nation's military—so diplomacy. The I is information. The M, of course, is military and military action. The E stands for economic action, such as sanctions.

Within the realm of diplomacy, we are taught and we work with Ambassadors, and we work through Embassies. We are taught about the realm of negotiations and treaties and various policies that affect different nations around the globe. We are engaging in international forums. Again, working in the defense space, of course, we have many opportunities to engage with leaders from other countries. Diplomacy—it is the very basis of the instruments of national power that we all learn.

I know Director Pompeo, in his capacity—whether serving at the CIA or going back many years to when he served in the U.S. Army, quite admirably, or back at the Academy when he was first taught those instruments of national power, or DIME, that he is well-versed in working with many nations in very difficult circumstances. Again, Director Pompeo has a very long record of public service.

Director Pompeo also has had very strong relationships, and he values those relationships. His relationship with Secretary of Defense Mattis will prove invaluable as he works to ensure peace through strength. Additionally, I am confident he will inspire and lead the men and women of our State Department to achieve results for our Nation, and those results will be centered around diplomacy.

Director Pompeo understands the threats we face as a nation every day. During a time when the threats against the United States continue to grow around the globe, it is important—important—for President Trump to have his full diplomatic and national security team in place. We must do this. Diplomacy. Diplomacy.

Director Pompeo is also the right person to serve as our top diplomat. He will rise to meet the challenges and foster the relationships we need around the world to keep our Nation free, secure, and prosperous. Again, I go back to the instruments of national power: D-I-M-E. The first is always diplomacy. Director Pompeo understands, and I am glad that we as a body will be taking up his confirmation vote today.

I urge my colleagues to support this eminently qualified man as our next Secretary of State.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING MATTHEW POLLARD

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I rise to note the

passing of, and acknowledgement of, the service of a valued member of the Intelligence Committee staff. On the evening of April 23, while attending a conference on behalf of the committee, Matthew Pollard lost his life to a heart attack. He was 52 years old. Matt is survived by his mother, three older sisters, and a young son Bradley, who was the cherished one.

Matt served honorably in the Army as an intelligence officer and twice deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, from 2003 to 2004, and Operation Enduring Freedom, from 2009 to 2010.

Matt was smart. He was really smart. He held a master's degree in strategic intelligence and mechanical engineering and was close to completing his third master's degree.

Matt had one of those jobs, like many who serve on my committee, that you can't talk about very much. That silence did not accurately reflect the value he brought to the Intelligence Committee. He filled a critical role. He was the majority staff member responsible for conducting oversight over the Nation's overhead architecture. In layman's terms, he knew satellites. Matt knew a lot about satellites. He knew about what they were capable of and what they weren't capable of. He knew what they cost and, perhaps more importantly, what they should not have cost.

Matt also had the unique ability to explain the unexplainable, which, as many here know, is a rare skill. Matt had a mind and an eye for detail, both technical and budgetary. He prided himself in finding ways to cut the costs of those fantastically expensive programs.

On our committee, he had a discerning eye for calling out contractors when he saw deficiencies. Matt was good-natured with his colleagues in industry. He was tough, but those same colleagues loved him. Matt would half smile, half frown at a presentation, and you could see contractors lower their heads and shuffle their feet a little bit because they knew Matt was right. He was universally respected and liked by all who encountered him, whether they sat on the same side of the table or whether they were on the other side. When Matt passed away on Monday, word literally spread around the country in a matter of hours. His loss is devastating to many, including the committee, the members, and the staff.

Matt actually served twice on the staff of the Intelligence Committee. He began his first tour with us in March of 2002. That first tour lasted 11 years. Matt couldn't stay away from the Senate for long, though, and he gave in to tremendous pressure from the Appropriations Committee to join them, which he did in April of 2014.

Matt's drive to serve was strong. When I became chairman in January of 2015, I had one objective: persuading him to rejoin the Intelligence Committee, and it was one of my top prior-

ities. I am eternally grateful that I was able to lure him away from the appropriators and know, without a doubt, he was one of the strongest members of the Intelligence Committee staff.

Matt studied. Matt inquired. He never backed down from a debate. Matt spoke his mind and spoke truth to power, and he did it often without bias. We loved him for all of it, and we will sorely miss Matt.

However, more importantly than the values he brought to the committee, to the U.S. Senate, and to the Intelligence Committee was how Matt conducted himself as a person and as a father. Matt loved his son Bradley. That is probably what I will remember most about Matt. Bradley was Matt's world—Boy Scouts, campouts, soccer games. If Bradley was involved, Matt was there. He was a great dad.

We weren't surprised when we heard that Matt recently misjudged the forecast. Despite wearing only a T-shirt and shorts in 40-degree temperatures and whipping winds, he cheered loudly as Bradley played his first soccer game. This is one small example of his devotion to Bradley, whom he proudly referred to as "my boy."

Bradley, I want to say thank you for sharing your father with us. We will forever be grateful.

Given Matt's hours and portfolio, he, like many of the staff, often worked on the weekends, and Bradley was a regular presence in the committee, on those weekends, in the committee space. He often could be found playing board games with kids of other staffers who were also working weekends and similarly engaged in finding a work-life balance.

Matt's devotion and generosity extended beyond Bradley. He was also known, on occasion, to lead many adventures around the Capitol. He would take him through the complex with small herds of children in tow so their parents could actually get some work done. Kids would come back full of stories with "guess what we did" to their parents.

We at the committee, and our sister committee on the House, will miss having the benefit of his wisdom and his experience. So, too, will those in the intelligence community who worked with Matt, to include the senior leadership at some of the most important agencies.

While the American people may have never known Matt by name, hopefully, this statement will give you some insight into his character and, more importantly, the contributions he made to our Nation's security. We will miss his expertise, his infectious sense of humor and, most importantly, his friendship.

Mr. President, before I yield, I would like to turn to Senator BLUNT.

Mr. BLUNT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly agree with and really understand and appreciate all the comments the chairman just made about