

is a fear of war in the region, it will be fueled by Iran and its proxies and exacerbated by an agreement that allows Iran to possess an industrial-sized nuclear program and enough money in sanctions relief to significantly continue to fund its hegemonic intentions throughout the region.” Senator MENENDEZ.

So many of our Democratic colleagues understood all this quite clearly when a Democrat occupied the White House, and it came true. It came true. Iran’s aggression only accelerated after the Obama administration’s deal. The question for us is not whom to blame. That much is clear. The question is what to do about it.

As Iran’s aggression became focused on the United States, as the risk to our personnel and interests grew, after months of repeated warnings, President Trump took action. I am glad the strike against Soleimani has provided some justice—some justice—to his countless victims, hundreds of Americans and many more across the Middle East.

We don’t yet know if Soleimani will prove irreplaceable, but his death will significantly disrupt Iran’s death machine and will change Iran’s long-held misconception that they could literally get away with the murder of Americans without a meaningful response. President Trump’s strategy seems to have reestablished deterrence.

The Senate risks jeopardizing what we have gained with this strike if it ties the military’s hands and tells Iran that we have no stomach for this. America can hardly be defeated on the battlefield, but we can be defeated at home on the political front. We can allow ourselves to become divided and play into the hands of our adversaries. Our divisions at home are significant. Let us not allow them to pollute our judgment on foreign affairs. Let’s not make our adversaries’ lives easier by tying our military’s hands.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter Gaynor, of Rhode Island, to be Administrator of

the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the House of Representatives has impeached the President for a very serious offense: coercing a foreign leader into interfering in our elections, using the powers of the Presidency, the most powerful public office in the Nation, to benefit himself—to actually influence the election, which should be decided by American citizens, not by a foreign power. When debating the impeachment clause of the Constitution, the Founders worried about foreign capitals having undue influence over our country. Hamilton, writing in the *Federalist Papers*, described impeachable offenses as abuses or violations of some public trust.

In the impeachment of President Trump, the question the Senate will be asked to answer is whether the President did, in fact, abuse his public trust and, by doing so, invite the very foreign influence the Founders feared would be a corruption of our democracy. To answer that question, to decide whether the President merits acquittal and removal from office, the Senate must conduct a fair trial. A fair trial has witnesses. A fair trial has relevant documents as a part of the record. A fair trial seeks the truth—no more, no less.

That is why Democrats have asked to call four fact witnesses and subpoena three specific sets of relevant documents related to the President’s misconduct with Ukraine. At the moment, my Republican colleagues are opposing these witnesses and documents, but they can’t seem to find a real reason why. Most are unwilling to argue that witnesses shouldn’t come before the Senate. They can only support delaying the decision until most of the trial is over, like a magic eight ball that keeps saying: Ask again later.

The most the Republican leader can do is smear our request as some partisan fishing expedition intended to damage the President, but the leader himself has warned that the witnesses we have requested might not help the House managers’ case against the President. He is right about that. These are the President’s top advisers. They are appointed by him, vetted by him. They work with him.

We don’t know what those witnesses will say or what the documents will re-

veal. They could hurt the President’s case or they could help the President’s case. We don’t know.

We know one thing. We want the truth on something as weighty and profound as an impeachment trial. Does Leader MCCONNELL want the truth? Do Senate Republicans want the truth?

I would remind the leader that our request for witnesses and documents is very much in line with the Senate’s history. The Republican leader keeps citing precedent. Well, here is precedent, Mr. Leader. There have been two Presidential impeachment trials in history. Both—both—had witnesses. The trial of Andrew Johnson had 41 witnesses. There have been 16 completed impeachment trials in the Senate’s entire history. In every one, except one, the trial in 1799 of Senator William Blount, which was dismissed on jurisdictional grounds, every Senate impeachment trial in history has included witnesses.

You want precedent? Precedent says witnesses overwhelmingly.

The long arc of history casts a shadow on the proceedings we are about to undertake. It suggests something obvious—that the Senate has always believed trials were about evidence and getting the truth. Of the 16 impeachment trials, 15 had witnesses and 1 was dismissed early. Do Senate Republicans want to break that lengthy historical precedent by conducting the first impeachment trial of a President in history with no witnesses? Let me ask that question again. This is weighty. This is vital. This is about the Republic. Do Senate Republicans want to break the lengthy historical precedent that said witnesses should be at in impeachment trial by conducting the first impeachment trial of the President in history—in history, since 1789—with no witnesses?

I ask that question because that seems to be where the Republican leader wants us to be headed. The Republican leader has designed a schedule for a Senate trial that might—might—have us vote on witnesses and documents after the presentations from both sides have been concluded—the judicial equivalent of putting the cart before the horse. Of course, Leader MCCONNELL has made no guarantee that he will support voting on witnesses and documents at that time—only that supposedly he will be open to the idea.

I want my Republican colleagues to bear in mind that if we consider witnesses at a later date, it could extend the trial by several days, maybe several weeks, as witnesses did during the Clinton trial.

Leader MCCONNELL has said that after the arguments are made, we should vote and move on. Do my Republican colleagues really believe Leader MCCONNELL will have an open mind about witnesses at a later date when they might extend the trial much longer than he wants? I am not in the prediction business, but I can bet that

when the time comes, Leader McCONNELL will say that we have heard enough, that the trial shouldn't drag on any longer, that the Senate doesn't need witnesses and documents, and that we should, just as he once said "vote and move on."

Before Senate Republicans are so quick to reject the Democratic proposal for a limited list of relevant witnesses and documents, I want them to consider that our proposal would save the Senate time. We want to confront the issue now, not be forced to extend the trial later. We want both the House managers and the White House defense counsel to have time to incorporate the testimony of witnesses into their presentations. That is the proper way to proceed. That is what happens at trials—collect all the evidence at the beginning, not at the end.

All we are asking is for the President's own men, his appointees, to come forward and tell their side of the story. The American people want a fair trial in the Senate. The American people know that a trial without witnesses and documents is not a real trial; it is a sham trial. And the American people will be able to tell the difference between a fair hearing of the facts and a coverup.

IRAN

Madam President, on Iran, the Senate will soon consider Senator Kaine's War Powers Resolution, which would prevent further hostilities with Iran without congressional approval. It is a crucial vote that will correctly assert this body's constitutional authority over matters of war and peace, and it is certainly timely.

The past few weeks have highlighted the President's impulsive, erratic, and often reckless foreign policy, the consequences of which have made Americans less safe and unnecessarily put our Armed Forces in harm's way. From North Korea, to Syria, to Russia, it is impossible to say the world is a safer place today than when President Trump took office, and it is very possible to say that President Trump, by his impulsive, erratic, and ego-driven actions, has made things worse.

With respect to Iran, the President's recent actions have increased the risk of further hostilities in the Middle East. The President campaigned on getting the United States out of "endless wars" in the Middle East, but the President has deployed thousands more U.S. troops in the Middle East with hardly an explanation to Congress or to the American people.

I have long been concerned that the President's chaotic, impulsive decisionmaking might stumble us into war. With Iran, like with many other places around the globe, the President's policy has brought us closer to the kind of endless war the President promised we would avoid.

It is past time for Congress to place a check on this President. On matters of war and peace, congressional oversight and congressional prerogatives

are not optional. I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote in favor of the Kaine resolution.

Senator SANDERS also has a bill that would deny funding for a war with Iran, of which I am a proud cosponsor. The Senate should consider that legislation as well. As the situation with Iran continues to evolve, the administration must come back and brief Congress on all major developments, troop deployments, and long-term strategy in the region.

CHINA

Madam President, finally, on China, tomorrow the United States will complete a signing ceremony for the so-called phase one trade agreement with China. After 18 months of negotiations, the phase one deal is remarkable for how little it achieves at an enormous price.

President Trump has agreed to scale back some tariffs on Chinese goods in exchange for temporary assurances that China will increase its purchase of U.S. exports over the next few years, particularly in agriculture.

For all the effort and turmoil over the past few years, the deal President Trump will sign tomorrow hardly seems to advance the United States past square one. It fails to address the deep structural inequalities in the trade relationship between China and the United States.

For the past decade, China has stolen American intellectual property through forced technology transfers of our companies and through outright cyber theft. The President's phase one deal doesn't even address this issue. China has routinely subsidized its most important domestic industries. Not just labor-intensive industries but even industries like Huawei are subsidized to gain unfair advantage over American companies. China has dumped goods illegally into our markets. It has manipulated its currency to keep prices low. The President's phase one deal doesn't address any of these issues.

Not only does this deal fail to make any meaningful progress toward ending China's most flagrant abuses, what it does achieve on the agricultural side may well be a day late and a dollar short. China has already made long-term contracts with other producers of soybeans and other goods in places like Argentina and Brazil. American farmers have already lost billions over the last 2 years, watched their markets disappear, and too many American farms have gone bankrupt in the time that it took President Trump to reach this deal.

I have publicly praised the President when he is tough on China, at some political cost. I have said he has had better instincts on China than previous administrations. Few politicians have been talking about securing real reforms to China's economic policies longer than I have. But I fear that with an election around the corner, the President is taking the easy way out—

settling for a weak deal that will cost American businesses, American farmers, and American workers for years and years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

IRAN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, this week we expect to vote on a War Powers Resolution related to operations in Iran. I am pleased that the President's demonstration of strength has restored our position of credible deterrence. Some have challenged that the President's action was escalatory, but the reality is that Iran had become increasingly bold. The United States responded in self-defense, and, as the President has said, it appears that Iran is standing down.

Hopefully Iran's tragic error in shooting down a civilian passenger plane has served as a sobering check on the regime's activities. We have seen thousands of Iranians rallying in the streets in recent days protesting the bringing down of the passenger plane and calling for change. I hope the people of Iran are able to organize and demonstrate in safety and that their hopes and prayers for change are answered.

Soleimani's death provides an opportunity for Iran to rethink its direction, to move away from brutally oppressing its citizens and fomenting violence throughout the Middle East. We should encourage such rethinking by continuing to make it clear through the sanctions the President has imposed and other measures that we will not accept Iranian aggression against Americans or our allies.

IMPEACHMENT

Madam President, on an issue closer to home, at the end of last week, Speaker PELOSI announced that she was finally ready to send over the Articles of Impeachment—the next step in a saga that began 3 years ago. That is right, on January 20, 2017—Inauguration Day—the Washington Post ran an article entitled "The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun."

It is important that we not forget this. We need to remember how we got here. Democrats would like to think that this impeachment was the result of a high-minded, impartial, thoughtful procession. It wasn't. It was the result of a 3-year-long partisan crusade to damage or remove this President.

It is fair to say that the actual impeachment process was the most rushed, most biased, and least impartial impeachment process in history. For evidence, look no further than the Democrats' behavior in the wake of the impeachment vote.

Democrats rushed the Articles of Impeachment through the House because, we were told, it was urgent that the President be removed from office. One Democrat even said that the House was acting hastily because there was "a crime spree in progress." And then what did Democrats do? Instead of

sending the Articles of Impeachment over to the Senate so the Senate could conduct a trial, Speaker PELOSI and the House Democratic caucus sat on the articles for close to a month.

The delay was so flagrantly unjustified that even Senate Democrats started to express their impatience with the House. "If it's serious and urgent, send them over." That is a quote from the highest ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee. She went on to say: "If it isn't, don't send it over." A fair point. But House Democrats never really believed in the seriousness and urgency of the articles. If they had, they would have sent them over to the Senate immediately.

Of course, while Senate Democrats have gotten impatient with the House, Senate Democrats have also demonstrated a healthy dose of partisanship around the impeachment.

Senate Republicans have proposed modeling the rules for the first phase of this impeachment trial on the rules that governed the Clinton impeachment trial—rules that were agreed to unanimously by Democrats and Republicans at the time—but Senate Democrats are having none of it. These rules were eminently fair and, as I said, were supported by every single Democrat before President Clinton's impeachment trial. These rules gave both sides—the House impeachment managers and the President and his team—an opportunity to make their case, and they gave Senators an opportunity to question both sides and only then make a determination as to whether additional information or witnesses were needed. These rules were good enough for Democrats and Republicans back then; they ought to be good enough for Democrats and Republicans today.

I am glad Speaker PELOSI is finally sending over the articles so we can move forward with this process and then get back to doing the work the American people sent us here to do, but I am saddened by the damage Democrats have done to the institution and the processes of government.

The overturning of an election—the overturning of the American people's choice—is a very serious thing. It is a remedy to be wielded only with careful deliberation, in the most serious circumstances.

The Democrats have spent the past 3 years treating impeachment not as a remedy of last resort but as a way of overturning an election where they didn't like the outcome. That is not what impeachment was intended to be. By hijacking the impeachment process for political purposes, Democrats have made it clear that they believe election outcomes don't matter and that they believe it should be the Democratic Party, not the democratic process, that decides elections. And that is profoundly disturbing.

This fall, the American people will have a chance to render their verdict on the Trump Presidency. In fact, Presidential primary voting begins in just a

few short weeks. It is a great pity that Democrats have sought to preempt the next Presidential election with a partisan impeachment process in Washington, DC.

I hope we can move beyond this impeachment and the hyper-partisanship the Democrats have engaged in over the past 3 years. This institution should be in the business of governing, not endlessly trying to overturn an election. I hope in the future we can keep impeachment as a serious remedy for the most serious of crimes, not as a political weapon to be used whenever a partisan majority in Congress despises the occupant in the White House.

We will do our constitutional duty in the Senate over the next few weeks, and after that, I look forward to getting back to the business of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Senate as it is currently meeting is in the normal course of business, but in just a few days, this Senate Chamber will change. It will no longer be the Senate considering resolutions and legislation; it will be a Senate considering an impeachment proceeding. It will be a piece of history for those who watch. This will be only the third time in the history of the United States of America that the Senate will be convening for an impeachment proceeding relative to the President of the United States. It is a matter of the most serious constitutional gravity, and I hope all of us as Members of the Senate will consider it and approach it that way.

Under the Constitution, we have a unique role as Members of the Senate. We are the jurors; we are the jury. There are 100 Senators who will decide whether the Articles of Impeachment should be voted on and whether the impeachment of the President of the United States should proceed.

We are also in a unique role under the Constitution in that we aren't just jurors sitting silently in the jury box. We are also judges in one respect. We set up the procedure, the way the trial moves forward.

Before I was elected to Congress, I used to practice trial law, and jurors had the ultimate word in terms of the fate of my clients, but the jurors didn't decide the procedure of the trial. That was decided by a judge. When it comes to an impeachment proceeding under the Constitution, the actual process or the procedure of the impeachment trial is decided by the jurors, the Senators. It is very unusual, but it was a decision made by our Founding Fathers to put this ultimate test of impeachment in the hands of the Senators.

Why pick the Senate? It could have gone to the Supreme Court or some other tribunal. Alexander Hamilton said that there were two reasons they wanted to bring the impeachment trial to the floor of the Senate. He said that the Senators, by their nature and polit-

ical composition, would be "independent and dignified"—his words, "independent and dignified." I hope he is right.

I was here 20 years ago during the Clinton impeachment trial, and I can remember very well how the temperament and mood and environment on the floor of the Senate changed when the impeachment proceedings began. There was the arrival of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in his judicial role to sit where the current Presiding Officer of the Senate is sitting and to preside over the trial. Instantly, when you walked into the Chamber and saw the Chief Justice, you knew this was different. This was a new challenge. This was being treated differently by the Constitution.

Then, of course, each of us, having been sworn in to be Senators representing the States that sent us, take a separate oath when it comes to our responsibilities under impeachment. That oath is fairly routine, but it includes one phrase that stands out when I read it. We swear that we will impart "impartial justice" as impeachment jurors—impartial justice. We hold up our hands and swear. We sign the book on the desk at the front of the Senate, as a matter of history, that we have made this oath for impartial justice. That is why I have been troubled, as we lead up to this impeachment proceeding, when I hear some of the statements and speeches that have been made on the floor of the Senate.

The Republican leader from Kentucky said very openly several weeks ago that he was going to work with the President's defense team to prepare for how he would handle the impeachment proceedings in the Senate. I understand there are some elements of this that just make sense that there would be conversation with the managers of the impeachment as to the procedure to be followed. But what we have heard, even today, on the floor of the Senate is more than just cooperation in setting up the workings of the impeachment proceeding. What we have heard from the Republican majority leader is nothing short of an opening statement at a trial. He has come to the floor even today to question, challenge, diminish, even ridicule the entire impeachment proceeding. To me, that steps over a line—a line where we were sworn to show impartial justice in this proceeding. When the Senator from Kentucky comes to the floor and says, for example, that this is a hurried process, he raises the question as to whether the impeachment proceedings in the House were appropriate. He is correct when he says that the previous impeachments have had lengthy investigations leading up to them. In fact, one I recall before I was elected to Congress involving President Nixon went on for months on questions of the Watergate scandal, which was at the heart of the proposed Nixon impeachment. There were special prosecutors and investigators and people who worked

constantly for month after month after month before the Articles of Impeachment were being prepared. You may recall that President Nixon resigned before the actual impeachment proceeding.

But, then again, there was the Ken Starr investigation under President Clinton. It, too, went on for months with sworn testimony and depositions and videotaped proceedings of witnesses that led up to the impeachment.

This is different. The case is being brought to us by the House of Representatives for the impeachment of President Trump. It is true that in comparison it had a shorter investigative process, shorter than the two I just referenced. But it is also true that the second count of the Articles of Impeachment raises the question as to whether the President cooperated in providing witnesses and evidence that led to the Articles of Impeachment in the House, and that is one of the counts of impeachment against him—that he didn't participate and cooperate.

For the Senator from Kentucky to stand here and say that it should have been a lengthier proceeding in the House—there should have been more witnesses; there should have been more evidence—is to ignore the obvious. One of the counts of impeachment raises the question as to whether the President appropriately denied any cooperation with the House impeachment proceeding.

Secondly, the Senator from Kentucky comes to the floor and consistently says that the suggestion that we should allow witnesses and evidence to be considered is evidence of the weakness of the case coming out of the House of Representatives. Well, there aren't an exact number of parallels between ordinary civil and criminal litigation and impeachment proceedings, but in the world of law and trials, there is usually an opening pleading or proceeding through a grand jury that leads to charges against an individual. I have been through that many times on the civil side—rarely, but once in a while, on the criminal side. The trial itself takes that initial pleading, that initial statement of a case, and elaborates on it, opens up, brings in evidence and witnesses on both sides.

When we talk about witnesses and evidence coming before the Senate on any impeachment proceeding with President Trump, it isn't just on one side of the case. What we are suggesting is there should be witnesses from both sides. Let the President bring those who he believes can speak most convincingly to his innocence. Let the House managers supporting impeachment take the opposite position and find those witnesses who they think tell the story from their side of the case. That is the nature of a trial. The American people have seen it over and over again in their personal lives and in what they have witnessed on television and other places. Both sides

put on their best evidence, and, ultimately, the jury decides the truth of the matter. That is all the Democrats are asking for here.

We are asking that the impeachment proceeding witnesses be allowed on both sides, evidence be allowed on both sides, and, ultimately, as Senator SCHUMER said earlier, we get to the truth of the matter; we make our decision in the Senate; and the American people get to witness this democratic process.

Senator MCCONNELL has said in many different places that he resists this idea of witnesses and evidence, but I hope he will reconsider. I hope at least four Republican Senators will reconsider—if they are in Senator MCCONNELL's position—and opt, instead, for the historic precedent of witnesses and evidence at a trial.

The Senate will change this week. If you are witnessing it through C-SPAN or in the audience in the Galleries, you will notice it. First, the Senators will be on the floor of the Senate, which is rare, and second, with the Chief Justice presiding, there is a much different air in the proceedings and business of the Senate.

The final point I want to make is that I am troubled by the continued suggestion that the prospect of an impeachment trial is holding the Senate hostage, that we cannot consider serious legislation because of the possibility of an impeachment trial. It is true that once the trial starts, we devote ourselves to it. But that hasn't happened.

So how do the leaders of the Senate on the Republican side explain the year 2019? It was a unique year in the history of the Senate. It was unique for what we failed to do. During the course of the entire year, the Senate considered 22 amendments total. There were 22 amendments on the floor of the Senate. Six were offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky, all of which, I believe, failed. But there were 22 amendments in a year. I can tell you that it is not unusual if you look at the history of the Senate for us to consider 22 amendments in the course of a week, sometimes in the course of a day. But in the entire year, there were only 22 amendments. Why? Because Senator MCCONNELL, who has the power under the Senate rules, decided there would be no business before the Senate but for the filling of judicial vacancies and other Executive appointments. That was it. A handful of other pieces of legislation were considered—the Defense authorization bill and, finally, a massive spending bill—but never with amendments. So to suggest that the impeachment trial has something to do with the inactivity in the Senate is to ignore the obvious.

Last year, before there were any Articles of Impeachment, Senator MCCONNELL, under his leadership, called for virtually nothing to be debated and considered on the floor of the Senate. I have said this before, and I stand by it.

This is a Senate Chamber, but too many days, in too many respects, it is a storage facility. We are storing the desks of the Senate, once occupied by Senators who came here to work. They offered bills, offered amendments, had real debates and votes. We look at these desks and say: Boy, it must have been a great day in the Senate when you actually did that.

For the Republicans to blame the impeachment process for the inactivity of last year defies common sense. For that reason, I hope that when the impeachment trial ends, Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, the Republican majority leader, will consider at least 1 of the more than 200 bills that the Democratic House of Representatives has sent us to consider—bills relating to healthcare, bills relating to the price of prescription drugs, bills relating to student loans, bills relating to immigration. They are all sitting somewhere in a file cabinet and a computer somewhere in Senator MCCONNELL's office. Maybe we can be the Senate after the impeachment trial. It is in the hands of Senator MCCONNELL to make that decision.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Madam President, let me speak to an issue that has been raised this morning, which is timely and critically important. The President tweeted last week to the country: "All is well." As we were teetering on the verge of war with Iran, he tweeted: "All is well."

But now details have come to light, and it is clear that all is not well. U.S. servicemembers of Ain Al-Asad Air Base in Iraq faced a sustained hour and a half of Iranian retaliatory attacks last week—a barrage described by one of the most senior commanders on the base as "designed and organized to inflict as many casualties as possible." Contrary to the tweet by our President that all is well, reports from witnesses suggest that despite heroic planning, we were, in fact, very fortunate—if not lucky—that none of our U.S. personnel were killed.

This gets me to the issue that needs to be brought before the Senate, one that goes to the heart of this Senate's critical, often neglected, constitutional responsibility. It is not whether Iranian General Soleimani was an enemy with American blood on his hands—that is a fact—but it is too simplistic to stop there. We have known that fact for a long time. Previous Presidents of both political parties have known General Soleimani's background—it is not in dispute—but it is a distraction to stop with that conversation.

The real question is whether President Trump, when he made the decision to target General Soleimani, considered the possibility that it would quickly escalate into a much larger confrontation with Iran, which is the possibility of a war—a distinct possibility and one never authorized by Congress.

Based on the administration's briefing last week, which I sat through, I

doubt if even they think they need congressional authorization to ask our sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters to participate in another war in the Middle East. The first question asked by Senator McCONNELL at the briefing, which was attended by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was whether there was a need for authorization under the War Powers Act before the United States continued to have its conflict with Iran. The answer that came from the Secretary of Defense was that there was no authorization necessary. He went on to say that he thought even the debate over authorization could be unsettling and troublesome for our troops if it appeared that we were uncertain as to whether we were ready to go to war.

Based on that briefing, I doubt this administration believes any congressional authorization is needed for the military action that has been taken or that might even be contemplated. Quite simply, the fact that the Senate has not exercised its constitutional right, authority, and responsibility to determine whether we should go to war with Iran troubles me. I am deeply concerned that if Iran retaliates further or if the President decides to escalate the confrontation, this Chamber will not even recognize—let alone act on—its constitutional responsibility under Article I, Section 8.

That is why I have joined my colleague and friend Senator TIM KAINE, of Virginia, in invoking the War Powers Act—a law passed over President Nixon's veto after Presidents of both parties deliberately misled the American people on the Vietnam war. It is hard for those who did not live during that era to appreciate what that war did to this Nation. First and foremost, it cost us almost 50,000 American lives, and hundreds of thousands of Americans were injured—men and women in uniform who bravely served our country. They gave their lives and came home with the scars they carried for their lifetimes. The billions of dollars that were spent and our involvement in that war, which divided this country at its core, are hard to put into words in just a few moments.

At the end of it, though, Congress realized that it had failed in its own responsibility to even declare a war against Vietnam. So we passed the War Powers Act and set up a process that said we are not going to let that happen again, that the American people will participate in any future decisions about whether we go to war, and that they will do it through their elected Congressmen and elected Senators.

The War Powers Act passed the Congress, and it was sent to President Nixon. He vetoed it and said we didn't want to give that additional authority to Congress. Then, in a rare, rare moment, Congress overrode President Nixon's veto, and the War Powers Act became the law of the land. That War

Powers Act, I believe, applies to the current situation that is escalating with Iran. That is why I have joined with Senator KAINE in his invoking the War Powers Resolution.

What I find particularly troubling about the administration's march to war in Iran is that the administration's own actions have contributed to the current tensions and problems we have with Iran. Before taking office, Iran's nuclear weapons program was halted because of an historic agreement President Obama negotiated. In cooperation with our allies in Europe, as well as with China and Russia, President Obama negotiated a treaty that required international inspectors to be on the ground in Iran to make certain that Iran lived up to its terms. Of course, Iran was not happy about these inspectors, but it accepted them. On several different occasions, we had representatives of those inspectors come and say, yes, that they had had virtually unlimited access to Iran in order to make certain Iran didn't violate the nuclear agreement. Iran continued in its malign behaviors in the region, but containment was easier without the threat of an Iranian nuclear bomb.

During the campaign, President Trump said the first thing he would do would be to eliminate that international agreement that required international inspectors, which is what stopped Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. It made no sense for the President to take the position that he did, but that is the position that he announced during the campaign, and that is exactly what he did after he was elected President. He withdrew the United States from this agreement that stopped Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Then he increased sanctions on Iran, and the tensions between our countries grew.

The President pursued a policy of regime change that is very difficult to explain, if not to justify—trying to flatter on one day and to confront on the next day. He proposed to meet with President Rouhani, of Iran, to negotiate a supposedly bigger deal, a better deal. Then he threatened Iran militarily and tightened sanctions soon after. These efforts went nowhere except to increase tensions between the United States and Iran. Iran lashed out on American interests. We were alienated from many of our allies, particularly those who were party to the nuclear agreement, and Iran inched closer to restarting its nuclear program.

In recent weeks alone, President Trump has managed to reverse the recent Iraqi protest settlement that warned Iran to stop meddling in its particular politics, which has led to the real possibility that American troops in Iraq that are critical to countering ISIS will be expelled.

Similarly, after months of anti-government protests in Iran, President Trump has almost instantaneously united the Iranian public opinion against us with the targeting of Gen-

eral Soleimani. Iran has now announced it will exceed the limits of the nuclear program that were imposed by the nuclear agreement, from which President Trump walked away, and our interests around the region are on high alert for fear of a retaliatory attack by the Iranians.

So there are real questions as to how President Trump's Iran policy serves long-term American security interests and as to whether this body is ready to at least debate the possibility of another war with Iran.

Before President Trump plunges us into another reckless Middle East war, shouldn't we first remember how we were fooled into invading Iraq in the first place? I remember full well.

I was a Member of the Senate when we were given the proposal of taking military action against Iraq because of its purported possession of these military devices that were threatening to the United States and to the region. Many of us were skeptical. The weapons of mass destruction charge didn't have the evidence that we thought was convincing. In the end, 23 Senators—22 Democrats and 1 Republican—joined in voting against the invasion of Iraq. I was one of those Senators. I was not convinced there were weapons of mass destruction. After the invasion and after careful inspection, it turned out that there were no weapons of mass destruction—the single event that really brought us into the conflict.

Then, as now, we were led to believe there was an urgent spiraling of events that required U.S. military intervention. Mark me down as skeptical—skeptical as to whether another invasion by the United States of a Muslim nation in the Middle East is in the best interest of national security.

Many around President Trump, particularly Secretary of State Pompeo, have been speaking of this conflict with Iraq for a long period of time. Some of them are the same people who endorsed the invasion of Iraq almost 20 years ago. We are still in Iraq. We have given up more than 5,000 American lives, with many having been injured and with \$1 trillion or more having been spent.

It is possible the Iraqis will just ask us to leave. Think of that. After all that we have put into their country, their legislature—their Parliament—voted several weeks ago to tell us to leave. In fact, one of the great tragedies of the Iraq war and one that few of its architects ever owned up to was that the Iraq war was actually empowering Iran in the region. Iran became a potent force because, in many respects, in its efforts in the Middle East, the United States created that opportunity.

These same unrepentant voices are again beating the drums for regime change in Iran and another war in the Middle East. They do so with a President who has made more than 15,000 false or misleading statements while he has been in office—15,000—with his

even going so far as to trust Vladimir Putin, the leader of Russia, over our own intelligence sources, making it impossible to trust anything he says when it comes to matters as grave as war.

Some have even had the audacity to argue that the 2001 authorization for use of military force in Iraq is somehow a permission slip for the invasion of Iran. That is preposterous. I cannot imagine anyone here who took that vote 18 years ago thought that he was authorizing for future Presidents 18 years later to invade another country in the Middle East. I certainly didn't. The Constitution is clear. Article I, section 8 says the power to declare war is an explicit power of Congress, as it should be. One should never send our sons and daughters into war without having the knowledge and consent of the American people. Our Founding Fathers were wise in making sure this awesome power did not rest with a King or a Queen or anyone pretending to be but with the people of the United States and their elected Representatives.

I have made this same argument and much of the same speech in the past regardless of whether the occupant of the White House was a Democrat or a Republican. This Congress, already afraid to stand up to many of President Trump's worst instincts, must not do so in a march to another war in the Middle East. As such, I urge my colleagues here to do our job and reaffirm the Senate's constitutional role in matters of war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Texas.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on January 20, 2017, at 12:19 p.m., the Washington Post ran a story with this headline: "The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun." Donald Trump had been President for only 19 minutes when that headline ran.

As we have since learned, it has been made abundantly clear that many of our Democratic colleagues simply don't recognize the President as having been legitimately elected, and they have been doing everything they can to remove him from office since he was first elected in 2016.

This has now taken a new form, that of impeachment—an impeachment that occurred 27 days ago when the House voted for two Articles of Impeachment. Their impeachment inquiry lasted 12 weeks, but it became clear that Speaker PELOSI and Chairman SCHIFF and Chairman NADLER were in a big hurry to get those Articles of Impeachment voted out of the House before the holidays. In the end, only the Democrats voted for these partisan Articles of Impeachment. Then the Speaker and the Democrats in the House declared victory.

That is when the breakneck pace of the impeachment process came to a

screeching halt. It appears Speaker PELOSI got cold feet when she realized the President would be afforded a fair trial in the Senate. That was not good enough for her. When we offered President Trump the same terms that President Clinton received during his trial, that wasn't good enough for Speaker PELOSI, for she wanted guarantees from the Senate. The Speaker of the House flatly refused to send the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate in order for her to somehow gain leverage over Senate trial procedures—a responsibility that falls far outside her job description. She was seeking assurances from the majority leader that he would redo the House's shoddy investigative work—something that is not part of our job description under the Constitution.

After weeks of holding the articles hostage with nothing to show for it, the Speaker has, apparently, finally caved. In holding the articles, she managed to accomplish something all too uncommon these days: she brought together Republicans and Democrats from both Chambers. Unfortunately, for the Speaker, this bipartisan, bicameral chorus of voices stood in firm opposition to her decision to withhold the articles.

Last week, she finally announced that she would be sending over the articles this week, and it now looks like a vote is scheduled for Wednesday, tomorrow, where impeachment managers will be identified, and the process of sending it to the Senate will begin in earnest. In a letter to her House colleagues on Friday, Speaker PELOSI indicated she would be sending the articles this week, and it looks like we are rapidly closing on the start of that trial.

As the majority leader has made clear from the beginning, this should be a far cry from the partisan impeachment process we saw in the House. We simply don't want to repeat the circuslike, partisan rush to impeachment that we saw in the House. Our responsibilities as Senators is to sit as a court—literally, as a jury—to consider the case that is being presented by the impeachment managers in the House as well as the President's lawyers.

Despite the Speaker's insistence, we, the Senate—the jury—are not going to be handpicking the witnesses before the trial begins. In no courtroom in America does the jury decide how the case before them will be tried. That is decided by the parties to the lawsuit, whether it is the prosecution in the case of a criminal case and the defense lawyer or the plaintiff and defense counsel in a civil case. The jury's job is to sit and listen and to weigh the evidence and to reach a verdict.

The Senate will—instead of the process Speaker PELOSI is advocating for—follow the only modern precedent we have, and that is the Clinton impeachment trial. If it was good enough for President Clinton, it is good enough for President Trump. We are going to fol-

low that precedent and provide for some order and fairness in the process and, again, not repeat the circus we saw in the House.

Just as we did in 1999, in the Clinton impeachment, we will begin with opening arguments. The impeachment managers, Speaker PELOSI's lawyers, will come over and present their case and argue their case. Then we will turn to the President's lawyers who will have a chance to respond. They can refer to some of the testimony of the 17 witnesses who testified during the House impeachment inquiry. They could offer additional evidence for the Senate to consider.

This is not a question of witnesses or no witnesses. That is a blatant misrepresentation by those who are trying to somehow work the public's understanding of exactly how this will proceed. As in the Clinton impeachment trial, all 100 Senators will have an opportunity to hear the case from both sides before making a decision whether we, the jury, want to have additional witnesses presented. That is what happened in the Clinton case, and that is what should happen with President Trump.

We will have an opportunity to ask written questions, which will be transmitted to the Chief Justice, who will then put those questions to the lawyers representing the impeachment managers and the President. Then we will be able to get information from them based on those questions.

The more I thought about it—ordinarily, in a trial you would have disputed facts, and then you would have the law applied to the facts as found by the jury, but the more and more I have heard about this impeachment inquiry, the more and more I am inclined to believe that the facts are not disputed. If the facts are not really disputed, why would you need additional witnesses?

There are people with opinions, there are people who draw inferences, and there are people who draw their own conclusions, but in the end, that is our job, not the witnesses' job. The witnesses' job is to provide the facts, should they be disputed, and it is our job then to decide whether this meets the constitutional standard of treason, bribery, or high crimes and misdemeanors.

What I find so amazing about these impeachment articles is neither one of them claim that President Trump committed a crime. Unlike the Clinton impeachment, where he was charged with perjury—with lying under oath—President Trump is not charged with any crime.

In the first Article of Impeachment, basically, what we have is a disagreement in the way in which the President handled aid voted by Congress that would then be given to the Government of the Ukraine. That is what this impeachment is about. This is not about high crimes and misdemeanors.

This is about political differences. This is about stylistic differences. This

is where diplomats and others disagree with the way the President handled himself. Well, fair enough, you are entitled to your opinion, but that doesn't make impeachment the appropriate remedy.

Here we are 11 months more or less until the next general election. I, for one, think it is dangerous to have 535 Members of Congress essentially be asked to convict and remove a President 11 months before the next general election; in other words, to substitute our views with those of the voters, the American people. I think that is very dangerous. If it succeeds here, I guarantee this will not be the last time.

Unfortunately, the House has normalized this concept of impeachment essentially for political differences. That is a dangerous concept, and it would be a dangerous precedent if we were to accept it.

This is the third time in American history—the history of our entire country—where this process will go forward in the Senate. We need to be very careful, very sober, very serious, and very deliberate in how we conduct ourselves and how we conduct this trial.

Unfortunately, Speaker PELOSI has violated her own admonition when, in March of 2019, she said that impeachment is too divisive, and it is just not worth it unless it is bipartisan, unless it is compelling. Well, this impeachment is neither bipartisan nor compelling. Speaker PELOSI apparently got stampeded by the more radical members of her caucus into this position, which now she is trying to find some face-saving way out. That is what this is about.

In the end, we know the politics, unfortunately, will continue in the Senate. We know that under the present circumstances, it is highly unlikely that 67 Senators, based on the record we know now, would vote to convict and remove the President. So what is all this posturing and grandstanding about with regard to witnesses or no witnesses—which I said earlier is a false choice. There will be witnesses, and there will be evidence. We are going to let the parties present it, and we are going to listen and make a decision.

This is about the Democratic leader trying to put incumbent Senators who are on the ballot in 2020 in a tough position. That is what this is all about.

In the end, this is not about President Trump. This is about who is going to maintain the majority in the Senate—whether Republicans will or whether the Democratic leader will accomplish his life's dream and become the next majority leader. That is what this is about.

Well, unfortunately, the Speaker's senseless delay tactics have robbed us all of the valuable time that we could have spent conducting this trial and moving on to more constructive business. We are waiting for the Speaker to deliver the articles, but in the meantime we are not sitting around twiddling our thumbs.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. President, last week, the Senate Finance Committee overwhelmingly passed the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement, which will replace NAFTA and guide our trade with Mexico and Canada into the future. This is a big deal for Texas and a big deal for the country. About 13 million jobs depend on trade between Mexico, Canada, and the United States.

We waited a long time for the opportunity to take up the USMCA. The heads of all three countries initially signed the deal back in November of 2019, and for over a year this is another example of the House foot-dragging.

At several points, we were left wondering whether the Speaker would intentionally blow up the trade deal over their own political motivations, but fortunately that didn't happen. We had a long delay, but we are finally to the point where the Senate can take up and pass the USMCA now that the House acted just before Christmas. This week, several Senate committees will review various portions of the agreement, and I hope we can actually get this trade agreement approved before we go to the impeachment trial. We will have the War Powers Resolution, which is privileged, and so that will come first, but hopefully there will be an opportunity to pass the USMCA before we go to this impeachment trial.

I have heard from countless of my constituents whose livelihoods depend on strong international trade, particularly with our southern neighbor, and they are eager to see this USMCA put to bed. It is frustrating that this process has already been prolonged and uncertainty has prevailed and kept farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers waiting for months on end, not knowing what ultimately would happen with the USMCA.

So I am ready for the Speaker to deliver her promise and finally transmit the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate so we can conduct that sober, deliberate trial according to the Constitution and then move on from these partisan games and get back to the work we were sent here to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to finish my remarks before the vote is called. I don't anticipate I will take very long.

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

NOMINATION OF PETER GAYNOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Peter T. Gaynor to be the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA.

I have known and worked with Pete Gaynor for over a decade. Before taking over as FEMA Deputy Administrator in 2018 and becoming the Acting Administrator in 2019, Pete was the

emergency management director for the city of Providence and then the State of Rhode Island.

As a U.S. marine, he was on duty near the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, and helped direct important aspects of the response and recovery efforts in the days and weeks that followed. Later, he went on to serve in U.S. operations in Iraq before returning home to Rhode Island.

As EMA, emergency management agency director in Rhode Island, Pete led the response to federally declared disasters in our State and worked to successfully earn national emergency management accreditation for both the Providence and Rhode Island emergency management agencies. I know he will tap this full experience to serve the American people as FEMA Administrator, and FEMA needs solid leadership.

Indeed, as the flagship Federal Agency for disaster preparedness and response, FEMA faces extraordinary challenges, confronting the very real effects of climate-related disasters, reforming the National Flood Insurance Program, administering critical grant programs, and helping ready the Nation for possible chemical, biological, and radiological attacks.

Make no mistake, I have deep concerns about many aspects of the administration's approach to disaster recovery. Puerto Rico is a case in point. Now it is facing new challenges. As ranking member of the Transportation-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, I have been dismayed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development's slow-walking of billions of dollars of disaster recovery assistance for Puerto Rico.

As the lead Agency for disaster response and recovery, FEMA must set the standard for professionalism and compassion for people and communities going through the worst experience of their lives. It is my expectation and my confidence that Peter Gaynor will work to make sure it happens.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm him.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending nomination of Peter Gaynor to be the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gaynor 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 Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER),

the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Ex.]

YEAS—81

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

NAYS—8

Brown	Menendez	Udall
Gillibrand	Schumer	Van Hollen
Harris	Stabenow	

NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Johnson	Murphy
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sanders
Cramer	Klobuchar	Warren
Inhofe	Markey	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The majority whip.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RECESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:04 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

MORNING BUSINESS—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, in the next few days, Senate Democrats will move to discharge a War Powers Resolution to tie the President's hands in defending this Nation against Iran and terrorist masterminds like Qasem Soleimani. Let's think about how we got here and the implications of this reckless action.

Qasem Soleimani has the blood of thousands of Americans on his hands and hundreds of thousands of innocent souls across the Middle East. For more than 20 years, he was the Supreme Leader's most trusted lieutenant, Iran's terror mastermind, and the man responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan by supplying the most deadly kinds of roadside bombs soldiers ever faced. He and his proxies and Iranian leaders like him are responsible for bombings of our Embassies in places like Lebanon and Kuwait. They are, in no small part, responsible for the ongoing horror of the Syrian civil war, for the civil war in Yemen. There is no doubt, based on the intelligence we have and this bloodthirsty past, that Qasem Soleimani was in Baghdad on January 2 to plot something very dangerous and very big that was going to target Americans once again.

We should all be thankful that Qasem Soleimani no longer walks the Earth, and we should be proud of the troops who executed that mission. The world is a safer place and America is a safer nation because of it. The people of Iran have been given a voice against the man who was responsible for mowing them down in protests over the years and whose death they have been out on the streets celebrating even though they risk being mowed down by their own security forces once again.

Yet, over the last 2 weeks, the Democrats have been able to do nothing but express their regret for the President's decision to eliminate Qasem Soleimani. And make no mistake—this War Powers Resolution is not about the future; it is about delivering an implicit or, if you listen to their words and don't just read the resolution, an explicit rebuke to the President for ordering the killing of Qasem Soleimani. They certainly want to prevent the President from doing anything like that in the future. That is why they have introduced this War Powers Resolution.

We should always remind ourselves when we are having a war powers debate, as we do from time to time, the War Powers Resolution is unconstitutional. It was passed by a liberal Congress in 1973 at the height of Watergate, and not a single President since then has acknowledged its constitutionality—not a single one, to include all the Democrats.

I hear a lot about the Constitution these days and reclaiming our authority to declare war and to constrain the Executive. I guess all those constitutional experts missed the Federalist Papers and their authoritative explanation of the Constitution and why we have the government we do. We have a House of Representatives with 435 people to be the institution that is most closely tied to popular opinion. We have a Senate to act as the cool and deliberate sense of community. And we have a single President—a single President—to act on behalf of the entire Nation in moments of peril.

Federalist 70, if they would just open up that authoritative explanation of the Constitution, says why there is one President, not a council of two or three or four, as some of the States had at the time of the founding. Because of the division of opinion and perspective and temperament that an executive council would have, there is one President—one President—who can act, as Federalist 70 said, with energy and dispatch and, yes, in some occasions, with secrecy. So if the Founders didn't think we should have an executive council of 3 or 4 or 5 people, imagine what they would have thought about 535 commanders in chief making operational decisions about when to take action on the battlefield.

These debates about War Powers Resolutions are really about how many lawyers and armchair rangers can dance on the head of a pin. Do you think wars and battles are won with paper resolutions? Those wars and battles are won with iron resolution. Do you think the ayatollahs are intimidated by "whereas" clauses and joint resolutions? The ayatollahs are intimidated, deterred, and scared when we incinerate their terror mastermind and we tell them that we will do it again if they harm another American.

Even if you grant the War Powers Resolution constitutional, look at the actual text of this resolution. It makes no exception for Iran developing a nuclear weapon. The ayatollahs could hold a press conference tomorrow or the Supreme Leader could tweet that they are going to rush to a nuclear breakout. The President would have to come to Congress if he would want to take any kind of action to deter it. It makes no exception for designated terrorist organizations and individuals, like the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and its Quds Force, who have killed so many Americans and continue to target them today. It makes no exception for attacks on our allies in the Middle East, nations like Israel.