

(ii) may enhance the security of the Internet of Things, including the security of critical infrastructure;

(iii) may protect users of the Internet of Things; and

(iv) may encourage coordination among Federal agencies with jurisdiction over the Internet of Things;

(E) the opportunities and challenges associated with the use of Internet of Things technology by small businesses; and

(F) any international proceeding, international negotiation, or other international matter affecting the Internet of Things to which the United States is or should be a party.

(3) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Secretary shall appoint to the steering committee members representing a wide range of stakeholders outside of the Federal Government with expertise relating to the Internet of Things, including—

(A) information and communications technology manufacturers, suppliers, service providers, and vendors;

(B) subject matter experts representing industrial sectors other than the technology sector that can benefit from the Internet of Things, including the transportation, energy, agriculture, and health care sectors;

(C) small, medium, and large businesses;

(D) think tanks and academia;

(E) nonprofit organizations and consumer groups;

(F) security experts;

(G) rural stakeholders; and

(H) other stakeholders with relevant expertise, as determined by the Secretary.

(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the steering committee shall submit to the working group a report that includes any findings or recommendations of the steering committee.

(5) **INDEPENDENT ADVICE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The steering committee shall set the agenda of the steering committee in carrying out the duties of the steering committee under paragraph (2).

(B) **SUGGESTIONS.**—The working group may suggest topics or items for the steering committee to study, and the steering committee shall take those suggestions into consideration in carrying out the duties of the steering committee.

(C) **REPORT.**—The steering committee shall ensure that the report submitted under paragraph (4) is the result of the independent judgment of the steering committee.

(6) **NO COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS.**—A member of the steering committee shall serve without compensation.

(7) **TERMINATION.**—The steering committee shall terminate on the date on which the working group submits the report under subsection (f).

(f) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the working group shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(A) the findings and recommendations of the working group with respect to the duties of the working group under subsection (b);

(B) the report submitted by the steering committee under subsection (e)(4), as the report was received by the working group;

(C) recommendations for action or reasons for inaction, as applicable, with respect to each recommendation made by the steering committee in the report submitted under subsection (e)(4); and

(D) an accounting of any progress made by Federal agencies to implement recommendations made by the working group or the steering committee.

(2) **COPY OF REPORT.**—The working group shall submit a copy of the report described in paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(C) any other committee of Congress, upon request to the working group.

SEC. 5. ASSESSING SPECTRUM NEEDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission, in consultation with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, shall issue a notice of inquiry seeking public comment on the current, as of the date of enactment of this Act, and future spectrum needs to enable better connectivity relating to the Internet of Things.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In issuing the notice of inquiry under subsection (a), the Commission shall seek comments that consider and evaluate—

(1) whether adequate spectrum is available, or is planned for allocation, for commercial wireless services that could support the growing Internet of Things;

(2) if adequate spectrum is not available for the purposes described in paragraph (1), how to ensure that adequate spectrum is available for increased demand with respect to the Internet of Things;

(3) what regulatory barriers may exist to providing any needed spectrum that would support uses relating to the Internet of Things; and

(4) what the role of unlicensed and licensed spectrum is and will be in the growth of the Internet of Things.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report summarizing the comments submitted in response to the notice of inquiry issued under subsection (a).

PREVENTING ILLEGAL RADIO ABUSE THROUGH ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 583 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 583) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FISCHER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 583) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 3:45 p.m. for a briefing and that when the Senate reconvenes at 3:45 p.m., it resume executive session and consideration of the Solomonson nomination.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:32 p.m., recessed until 3:45 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COTTON).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session and consideration of the nomination of Matthew H. Solomonson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

The Senator from New Mexico.

IRAN

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I begin by saying that my prayers are with our Armed Forces and their families. They stand watch despite the threat of danger, and they rely on their leaders to make wise decisions. I am grateful that there were no casualties during last night's missile attack.

For well over a year, I have been sounding the alarm that this President could bring us to war with Iran through mistake, misjudgment, or miscalculation. I have urged this body to assert our constitutional authority and pass our bipartisan bill to prevent a war with Iran.

In 2018 and 2019, I introduced the Prevention of Unconstitutional War with Iran Act. In June of last year, my amendment to prevent unauthorized war earned bipartisan majority support in the Senate, and it passed in the House of Representatives. It may not have become law, but the Constitution has not changed. Now, on the brink of war with Iran, it is long past time for Congress to step up to its constitutional responsibilities and stop the march to an unauthorized war.

Americans oppose another war in the Middle East. Despite the President's claim to the contrary, war with Iran would certainly not "go very quickly." That is what the President has said—"go very quickly." Any war with Iran would be prolonged, bloody, and costly. Yet, even if you support a war with Iran, we all swore an oath to uphold the Constitution, and Congress—and Congress alone—has the authority, under article I of the Constitution, to declare war.

Any country would consider the President's strike on one of Iran's highest ranking military commanders—someone whom many consider to be the second most powerful person in Iran's Government—to be an act of war. Now, predictably, Iran has

responded. So Congress must no longer hide from its constitutional responsibility.

If Congress does not stop the military conflict with Iran, this President will continue to take a wrecking ball through the Middle East, making one impulsive decision after another while having no long-term plan or strategic goal in sight. The President's speech made it clear he has no strategy to defuse the situation or to achieve a diplomatic result. He will continue the provocative warpath we are on.

While we may now be in a period of relative calm, the position we are in is untenable, and it is because the President abandoned diplomacy and created this crisis. The administration did not consult Congress before carrying out the strike, which is something that, typically, an administration would do before carrying out a strike like this; it would have a true consultation with the top leaders in the Congress. The administration did not consult our allies or try to form a coalition around what is clearly a highly provocative action that has ramifications for international security.

This is kind of a reminder of the run-up to Iraq. What did that look like, the run-up to the Iraq war? Sketchy evidence, bad intelligence, outright misrepresentations, and a call for vengeance against Saddam Hussein are what got us into the war in Iraq. This is where we are today in our conflict with Iran. The administration's vague assertions of an imminent threat, without its having concrete evidence, and its ever-changing story are too reminiscent of the origins of the war in Iraq. The echoes of Iraq are chilling.

Congress, step up. Do your constitutional duty. Rein in this reckless course we are on.

Let me say this, not just to those of us in this body who are speaking up but also to the thousands across the country who are marching against a rush to war: To speak out against a war with Iran is a patriotic activity, a patriotic duty. It is the right action to take, and it is the right thing to do. We are speaking up to stop this Nation from repeating the grave mistakes of the Iraq war. We are speaking up because we love this country, because we do not want to see another military family mourn a loved one who loses his life in a war that does not need to be fought and that we have the power to stop and to avoid.

President Trump set this disastrous course in motion in May of 2018 when he unilaterally withdrew from the Iran nuclear agreement. This was a deal the international community stood firmly behind. It reminded everyone—European countries, Russia, and China—that we were all a part of this deal. That agreement took the single greatest threat to the U.S. and international security—that being Iran—off the table. It prevented Iran from developing nuclear weapons. According to the International Atomic Energy Agen-

cy and President Trump's military and national security experts, Iran was complying with the agreement when the President withdrew.

The nuclear agreement did not solve all of the problems with Iran, but it is clear that the diplomatic effort reduced tensions with a longstanding adversary and reduced the threat of hostilities. Yet, instead of working to build on this progress, the President precipitously withdrew from the agreement and began his maximum pressure campaign to force Iran to capitulate to a long list of impossible demands. The President promised he would get us a "better deal." That is what he said—get us a "better deal." He has not. There is no better deal in sight.

I call on the President and his administration to use all of their diplomatic tools to deescalate this threatening situation—a situation that risks American lives. I call on them to work with our allies to find a path back to the nuclear limits the international community agreed to, to develop channels for productive communication and diplomacy, and to work toward stabilizing an unstable Middle East.

Leader MCCONNELL and the Republican leadership must bring this debate to the Senate floor. Senator KAINE's recently filed War Powers Resolution is one step in that direction. Senator PAUL and I have called upon all Senators to support our Prevention of Unconstitutional War with Iran Act. We must keep up this fight and block funds for any war with Iran in the absence of congressional authorization, and we must repeal the outdated authorizations of force that are being abused—the one from 2001 and the one from 2002.

I strongly support our oath to defend our Nation and the Constitution from any enemies, foreign and domestic, including against a President who would take us to war without his having constitutional authority. If we do not act now to preserve our constitutional structure and to assert our constitutional authority, we fail the men and women in uniform whose lives we put at risk; we fail our oath to defend and protect the Constitution; and we fail the American people, who sent us here to represent them on the most consequential decision our country can make.

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. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I would like to take a few moments today to talk about the current situation with regard to Iran.

First, the decision to take out Qasem Soleimani. Let's remember who he was.

He was leader of the Quds Force and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps—both of these groups, by the way, having been designated as terrorist organizations.

He was responsible for providing the Shia militias in Iraq with explosively formed penetrators. What does that mean? These were the extremely deadly improvised explosive devices—so-called roadside bombs—that were responsible for killing over 600 American soldiers and injuring many more, at least a couple thousand.

Some of those maimed or killed were from my home State of Ohio. My heart goes out to their families for their sacrifice.

I got a chance to see some of these brave Americans in visits to the Landstuhl military hospital in Germany and the Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington, DC. We must never forget their courage and the sacrifices they and their families have made.

Over the past 2 months alone, Soleimani helped direct more than 11 attacks against our forces in Iraq. In fact, he was found recently to be plotting more. When he was killed, he was plotting additional and imminent attacks with the commander of the Shia militia—the same commander who directed both the rocket strikes that killed the American contractor and wounded four American service personnel in Erbil and the demonstration and assault against the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

Thankfully, that commander was taken off the battlefield as well.

For reasons I have outlined, the killing of Qasem Soleimani was both legitimate and justified. His history of fomenting terror and murdering innocents goes back decades, and the world is a better place without him.

Some of my Democratic colleagues have been critical of the President's actions against Iran, to include the killing of Soleimani. Some argue that our actions have been unwarranted and belligerent. In fact, given the facts, I believe President Trump has shown restraint in the face of continued Iranian aggression over these past 18 months.

By authorizing the killing of the leader of terrorist organizations that were actively plotting more violence against our brave men and women, I believe President Trump reset the concept of deterrence and fulfilled his duties as President.

As GEN David Petraeus said after the Soleimani action, "This was a significant effort to re-establish deterrence." I would call that peace through strength.

Last evening's Iranian missile attacks against our forces and air bases at Erbil and Al-Asad was a continuation of the reckless and provocative approach. Thanks to the professionalism and capability of our Armed Forces, despite over a dozen Iranian missiles aimed their way, there were, fortunately, no American or allied troop or Iraqi casualties—amazing—

and there was only minimal damage to our bases. For that, of course, we are very thankful.

I listened to President Trump this morning, and I agree that the maximum pressure campaign against Iran must continue, and it should include additional sanctions.

There is a way forward for Iran to rejoin the international community rather than continue to be a pariah and the top sponsor of state terrorism in the world. President Trump has said on many occasions he is willing to negotiate with Iran if they cease their belligerent actions in the region and come to the table.

We do not desire war with Iran, but we cannot and will not stand idly by as they continue to attack Americans, continue to kill our forces in the Middle East.

I have been in meetings with top administration officials today and yesterday, and I look forward to continued discussions on their strategy moving forward.

I will continue to pray for the safety of our men and women in uniform who are forward deployed, who put their lives in danger for all of us and do so for the sake of peace and stability.

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.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I first want to say how relieved I am by reports that no lives were lost in last night's missile strikes in Iraq and how grateful I am for all those serving in the region and around the world.

The fact remains, however, that this is a volatile and frightening moment for our country. In a matter of days, the President of the United States has, without any authorization or notice, taken steps that have sent tensions soaring with Iran, threatened the fight against ISIS, jeopardized relationships with key allies, risked the safety of U.S. servicemembers and civilians, and brought us perilously close to war.

I have heard from so many people in my home State of Washington, and I know my colleagues have as well, about just how scary and uncertain this feels and the many questions it raises.

While there is no question Qasem Soleimani was a sworn enemy of the United States, people want to know whether the President's initial order was truly necessary to our safety and why right now in this time of already heightened tensions in the Middle East.

They want to know elected officials here in the Nation's capital are prioritizing their safety and our country's safety. Most of all, they want to know what comes next and what can be done to prevent things from getting worse.

Like so many Americans, I have watched these events unfold with increasing concern. As the daughter of a World War II veteran and Purple Heart recipient, I make decisions about the safety and security of our Nation with deep concern for our brave servicemembers and their families, a personal understanding of the sacrifices they make for all of us and our Nation, and an unwavering commitment to ensuring they have the support they need while they serve and when they come home.

To that end, while I firmly believe we must do everything possible to keep America safe and go after terrorists wherever they are, I also believe that, except in the most dire of circumstances, we should do everything possible to exhaust all of our diplomatic avenues and coordinate with our allies and our partners before taking military action all on our own.

I believe we should not enter a conflict without a very strong understanding of what we are trying to accomplish and what it will cost and that while America has every right to defend itself, striking another country preemptively, without the strongest evidence of immediate danger, is a dramatic step with significant long-term implications that should not be done without a full debate and congressional support.

Madam President, based on what we know now, the administration's actions in Iraq failed on each of these counts. It has not made us safer, and our allies feel blindsided, especially because this strike puts them at risk too.

There is no clear goal or clear-eyed understanding of the risks we have assumed. There was absolutely zero debate in this Congress and—unless you happened to be on the golf course with the President—absolutely no notification that he planned to massively escalate tensions with a foreign power overnight.

While, unfortunately, this is exactly the type of scenario many of us feared would arise from this President, I can't say it is surprising. President Trump's repeated reckless actions in the region, beginning with his decision to pull out of the Iran nuclear deal, have jeopardized critical objectives, leaving us without any clear strategy for restoring peace or protecting our troops and allies. We cannot assume Iran is done retaliating, and we must assume ISIS or other terrorists will take full advantage of the increased instability in the region.

In the face of challenges as serious as these, none of us in Congress, regardless of party, should be willing to just stand by and accept that our Nation's foreign policy and safety could be up-

ended by an impulsive late-night tweet. I certainly won't. Instead, I will continue to demand that the President provide us his legal justification for his order, commit to coming before Congress in advance of any further escalating steps as this now plays out, and explain how he will manage the consequences of his decision, with the goal of protecting Americans, our allies, and our interests.

I will continue to advocate for strategies that lead us toward safety and security rather than fan the flames. In the coming weeks, I look forward to voting in support of my colleague from Virginia, Senator Kaine's War Powers Resolution, and I am very glad to be a cosponsor. This resolution would reassert congressional authority, block President Trump's ability to start a war with Iran, and allow us to hear whatever case he may have before taking a vote on whether this is really the path we want our Nation to go down.

I hope every one of our colleagues listens to the people across this country who do not want to find themselves in an avoidable war and who sent us here to act as an independent branch of government, not a rubberstamp for an increasingly volatile administration. I hope they join us and support this resolution.

Madam President, finally, I will say that I voted against the war in Iraq because I felt the administration was asking us to send our brave men and women into harm's way without clear plans or goals. Today, this President isn't even asking. The goals and plans are even less clear, and the path ahead of us is very uncertain.

Congress has the power to ensure a debate, press this administration for a strategy, and check their power if they do not present a compelling one. It is well past time we used it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, this holiday season, the ancient darkness of anti-Semitism cast a shadow over New York City during Hanukkah, the Festival of Lights. The New York Police Department recorded at least nine separate attacks against Jews—more than one attack for each day of Hanukkah. New attacks are reported seemingly on a daily basis.

In Crown Heights, the site of deadly anti-Semitic riots incited by Al Sharpton in 1991, a group of men beat up an Orthodox Jew and attacked another with a chair.

In Williamsburg, another group terrorized an elderly Jewish man on the street. "Jew, Hitler burned you," one of the criminals reportedly said. "I'll shoot you."

Just outside the city, in Rockland County, a man with a machete stormed a celebration in a rabbi's home and injured five worshippers, leaving two in critical condition. The family of one victim, Josef Neumann, says he may never wake up from his coma.

These heinous attacks are part of a growing storm of anti-Semitism that has made Jewish Americans fearful to worship and walk the streets in their own communities. They come in the wake of the deadly rampage at the kosher market in Jersey City that left four innocent people dead, including a police detective, and of course they come in the wake of the deadliest anti-Semitic attack in our Nation's history: the massacre of 11 Jews at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh by a White supremacist.

According to the FBI, our country suffered a 37-percent increase in anti-Semitic crimes between 2014 and 2018. According to the New York Police Department, the city suffered a 26-percent increase in anti-Semitic crimes in the past year alone. That increase is alarming enough. So is the fact that most hate crimes reported in New York are crimes against Jews. While some of the increase is due to better reporting, much of it is not.

Jewish Americans bear witness to this harsh reality. Anti-Semitism is an ancient hatred, and today it appears in new disguises. It festers on internet message boards and social media. It festers in so-called Washington think tanks like the Quincy Institute, an isolationist, blame-America-first money pit for so-called "scholars" who have written that American foreign policy could be fixed if only it were rid of the malign influence of Jewish money. It festers even on elite college campuses, which incubate the radical boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement—a movement to wage economic warfare against the Jewish State. These forms of anti-Semitism may be less bloody than street crime in New York, but they channel the same ancient hatred, the same conspiratorial and obsessive focus on the Jewish people.

Anti-Semitic attacks are a symptom of a larger breakdown of public order in our major cities caused by politicians who are letting dangerous criminals roam our streets.

While Jews were being attacked in New York City, a law went into effect eliminating pretrial detention and bail for most crimes, including serious crimes like stalking, arson, robbery, and even manslaughter and negligent homicide. This law was a gift to criminals just in time for the holidays. In some cases, it came with an actual gift. New York City's criminal justice system gives goodies like taxpayer-funded movie tickets to criminal suspects just for showing up to court—movie tickets for criminals. I wish I were joking, but the joke is on the law-abiding citizens of this Nation.

These soft-on-crime politicians are doing their best to make crime pay in New York. Releasing criminals is the logical next step for the criminal-leniency movement.

Thanks to the new bail law, an estimated 3,800 criminal suspects were released from New York jails before New Year's Day. Many of those suspects

were arrested for new offenses within hours—within hours—of their release.

Case in point: On the sixth day of Hanukkah, December 27, Tiffany Harris was arrested for attacking three Jewish women in Crown Heights. She shouted "F-you Jews" as she slapped them in a rage. Despite the violent nature of her crime, Harris was amazingly released without bail the very next day, December 28, the seventh day of Hanukkah. On the eighth day of Hanukkah, Harris was arrested yet again for assault. She was released for a second time the day after that and is in custody now only because she was arrested for now a third time for failing to comply with a court order.

I can only imagine how demoralizing it must be for New York's police officers to arrest a violent criminal, only to risk their safety arresting them the next day for harming somebody else and the next day and the next day. How terrifying it must be for the witnesses of those crimes to contemplate giving evidence while the criminals they witnessed stalk the streets the very next day. And how enraging it must be for New York's Jews to suffer constant anti-Semitic attacks and know that the perpetrators will slide through a revolving door from the lockup back into their communities to spread more of their virulent, anti-Semitic hatred.

Soft-on-crime politicians claim that cash bail and strong policing punish the poor, but is there a worse punishment for poor communities than flooding them with dangerous criminals, making them unlivable for many law-abiding Americans who call those neighborhoods home? Guess what. Those dangerous criminals aren't going back to live in fancy penthouses in the Upper East Side. They aren't living behind gated communities in Bethesda and Arlington. They are living in the very communities that most need policing. That is why the consequences of criminal leniency never fall on the rich elites who praise it the most. Instead, the consequences fall on the less fortunate and on the brave officers who are duty-bound to uphold the law, even as they receive less and less support from the political class.

The real solution to disorder in our cities is the same as it always has been: more and better policing. New York's finest and police officers all across the country have broken crime waves in the past using steely resolve and superior force. They can do it again, if only we give them the freedom and support they need.

Thankfully, most Americans know whose side we are on in the fight against crime. We stand with cops, not criminals. We stand for the Jewish people against the ancient hatred that stalks them even to this day.

America liberated Nazi death camps in World War II, and we have served as a haven for persecuted Jews for longer than that. We must not allow the bigotry so common in Europe and the Middle East to spread here to our free

shores. We must not allow our city streets to be plunged into the lawlessness of the not so distant past.

IRAN

Madam President, I want to commend our brave troopers and our intelligence officers and the President for the daring strike last week on Qasem Soleimani. Qasem Soleimani had the blood of thousands of Americans on his hands, and he was plotting to kill more Americans just like his terrorist proxies had killed in Iraq on December 27. He even was picked up, when he landed at Baghdad International Airport, by a terrorist culpable for the bombing of our Embassy in Kuwait in 1983.

You would think that everyone would celebrate the death of a terrorist monster, but, no, you would be wrong. You would be wrong. Our Democratic friends have been criticizing and complaining ever since Qasem Soleimani died Thursday night.

Two particularly surprising complaints I have heard are that the Democrats weren't notified in advance and that Qasem Soleimani's plot wasn't imminent. Let's think about those criticisms.

The Speaker of the House and the minority leader weren't notified in advance of a target of opportunity against a terrorist mastermind. I am sorry, but what did you expect? Is the President or Secretary of Defense or Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff supposed to call hours in advance when they don't even know if the target will show up where our intelligence expects?

Were they supposed to call when the missile was in the air? Give me a break. Give me a break.

I will share what the majority leader told us yesterday about the raid on Osama bin Laden. Do you think he got notified in advance? No. Did he expect to be notified in advance? No. He said the Secretary of Defense called him after the strike to give him a brief summary of what had happened, and the majority leader, in 2011, simply said: "Congratulations." He put out a public statement to the exact same effect. Where is that sense of patriotism and pride from the Speaker of the House and from the minority leader today with the elimination of Qasem Soleimani?

Second, this critique that, well, Qasem Soleimani wasn't plotting an imminent attack—I mean, we are talking about how many terrorists can dance on the head of a pin here. Qasem Soleimani had been killing Americans for 30 years. He was flying around the Middle East to meet with his terrorist proxies in Syria and Lebanon and Iraq to plan how to kill more Americans.

We just had a briefing downstairs with the Director of the CIA and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in which they said: Yes, the plot was imminent. Intelligence is never ironclad, though. It can rarely say a strike is going to happen at this

time on this day at this target. That is apparently the standard the Democrats want to hold the President to—not weeks, not even days, not even a period of days against a hard target that presented an opportunity, as Qasem Soleimani did last Thursday night.

Let me say this: Imminence is ultimately a question of judgment that has to be made by the people we have elected to make those decisions for our country. It is not a question of intelligence. Our intelligence officers have great skills and capabilities. They can tell us the best intelligence they have that suggests the timing of such attacks. But it is ultimately the people's elected representatives who make those judgments.

I will just submit that if you are a soldier sitting in Iraq with Qasem Soleimani flying around trying to decide when to kill you, the question of imminence probably looks a lot different than if you are a comfortable Senator sitting behind guarded doors with armed security details protecting your every movement.

I will simply say yet again that Qasem Soleimani got exactly what he deserved. All those Americans he killed and their families also got what they deserved: justice. America and the world are a safer place because Qasem Soleimani is no longer a part of this world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Solomson nomination?

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Ex.]

YEAS—89

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Baldwin | Fischer | Peters |
| Barrasso | Gardner | Portman |
| Bennet | Graham | Reed |
| Blackburn | Grassley | Risch |
| Blumenthal | Hassan | Roberts |
| Blunt | Hawley | Romney |
| Boozman | Heinrich | Rosen |
| Braun | Hirono | Rounds |
| Brown | Hoeven | Rubio |
| Burr | Hyde-Smith | Sasse |
| Cantwell | Inhofe | Schatz |
| Capito | Johnson | Scott (FL) |
| Cardin | Jones | Scott (SC) |
| Carper | Kaine | Shaheen |
| Casey | Kennedy | Shelby |
| Cassidy | King | Sinema |
| Collins | Lankford | Smith |
| Coons | Leahy | Stabenow |
| Cornyn | Lee | Sullivan |
| Cortez Masto | Loeffler | Tester |
| Cotton | Manchin | Thune |
| Cramer | McConnell | Tillis |
| Crapo | McSally | Toomey |
| Cruz | Menendez | Udall |
| Daines | Merkley | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth | Moran | Warner |
| Durbin | Murkowski | Whitehouse |
| Enzi | Murphy | Wicker |
| Ernst | Murray | Young |
| Feinstein | Paul | |

NAYS—8

| | | |
|------------|-----------|---------|
| Booker | Klobuchar | Schumer |
| Gillibrand | Markey | Wyden |
| Harris | Sanders | |

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|-----------|--------|--------|
| Alexander | Perdue | Warren |
|-----------|--------|--------|

The nomination was confirmed.

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Ex.]

YEAS—51

| | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Barrasso | Fischer | Paul |
| Blackburn | Gardner | Portman |
| Blunt | Graham | Risch |
| Boozman | Grassley | Roberts |
| Braun | Hawley | Romney |
| Burr | Hoeven | Rounds |
| Capito | Hyde-Smith | Rubio |
| Cassidy | Inhofe | Sasse |
| Collins | Johnson | Scott (FL) |
| Cornyn | Kennedy | Scott (SC) |
| Cotton | Lankford | Shelby |
| Cramer | Lee | Sullivan |
| Crapo | Loeffler | Thune |
| Cruz | McConnell | Tillis |
| Daines | McSally | Toomey |
| Enzi | Moran | Wicker |
| Ernst | Murkowski | Young |

NAYS—47

| | | |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Baldwin | Hassan | Rosen |
| Bennet | Heinrich | Sanders |
| Blumenthal | Hirono | Schatz |
| Booker | Jones | Schumer |
| Brown | Kaine | Shaheen |
| Cantwell | King | Sinema |
| Cardin | Klobuchar | Smith |
| Carper | Leahy | Stabenow |
| Casey | Manchin | Tester |
| Coons | Markey | Udall |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth | Merkley | Warner |
| Durbin | Murphy | Warren |
| Feinstein | Murray | Whitehouse |
| Gillibrand | Peters | Wyden |
| Harris | Reed | |

NOT VOTING—2

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Alexander | Perdue |
|-----------|--------|

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Roumel nomination?

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, 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 for this 10-minute vote.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand?

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Ex.]

YEAS—91

| | | |
|------------|--------------|-----------|
| Baldwin | Capito | Crapo |
| Barrasso | Cardin | Cruz |
| Bennet | Carper | Daines |
| Blackburn | Casey | Duckworth |
| Blumenthal | Cassidy | Durbin |
| Blunt | Collins | Enzi |
| Boozman | Coons | Ernst |
| Braun | Cornyn | Feinstein |
| Brown | Cortez Masto | Fischer |
| Burr | Cotton | Gardner |
| Cantwell | Cramer | Graham |