

Ford, Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research, was especially powerful on this point. Mr. Ford told the committee:

In my experience, throughout my time in the executive branch, I've really never seen someone so abusive to such a subordinate person.

He said he could think of no one else who comes even close to John Bolton in terms of the way that he abuses his power and authority with "little" people.

Secretary Powell's Chief of Staff, Larry Wilkerson, described to the committee staff the kinds of problems he had on a daily basis in dealing with Bolton.

Assistant secretaries, principal deputy assistant secretaries, acting assistant secretaries coming into my office and telling me, "Can I sit down?"

"Sure, sit down. What's the problem?"

"I've got to leave."

"What's the problem?"

"Bolton."

When asked if he got similar complaints about other Under Secretaries, he replied:

On one occasion, on one particular individual. The rest were all about Undersecretary Bolton.

In summarizing this experience Wilkerson stated, "I think he's a lousy leader. And there are 100 to 150 people up there"—meaning at the U.S. mission to the U.N.—"that have to be led. They have to be led well, and they have to be led properly."

Being ambassador to the United Nations is not just a representational job; it is also a management job. There are 125 full-time, permanent State Department employees working there at our mission alongside numerous detailees from other agencies and departments. The ambassador has supervisory responsibility over all these people. Most are career civil servants, and they are there to represent the policies of the President and to serve the interests of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SARBANES. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to conclude the statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SARBANES. What are they going to do up there in New York if John Bolton repeats the kind of abusive behavior that led people in the State Department, under incredible pressure, to seek the support and counsel of their assistant secretaries? There will be no one in New York to shield them from the wrath and vindictiveness of John Bolton.

Mr. President, unfortunately, it seems to have become, for some, a favorite pastime to assault the United Nations. They blame it for failing to resolve many of the problems that have occurred in the world. But I think we have to acknowledge that the U.N. has a role to play in preventing conflict and promoting cooperation. Skillful

U.S. leadership at the United Nations can enhance our national interest in a very significant way, and part of that skilled leadership is to send an ambassador who has credibility and the wisdom necessary to carry out his responsibilities.

This nominee falls far short of that standard. Mr. President, 102 retired diplomats have taken the extraordinary step of sending a letter urging the Senate to reject the nomination.

Finally, let me say just this word about the witnesses who came forward to the committee to testify about Mr. Bolton's past conduct. These people, in effect, volunteered themselves to give what they thought would be an accurate view of Mr. Bolton's behavior. It took a lot of courage for people like Mr. Ford, Mr. Wilkerson, Mr. Hutchings, Ambassador Hubbard, and others to come forward. I am very concerned they may pay a price for this brave action, and I very deeply regret if this should turn out to be the case. I think their motive in coming forward was to promote the national interests of our country. In that sense, I think they are true patriots. They have nothing to gain by opposing the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SARBANES. In fact, they have much to lose.

Mr. President, this nomination ought to be defeated. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it. We can do better, and, for the sake of our country, we must do better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask if we could get a unanimous consent request here. The Senator from Arizona, my colleague from Arizona, I believe is next. How long does he wish?

Mr. KYL. I would like to speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCAIN. The Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KENNEDY. Nine minutes.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona be recognized for 10 minutes, the Senator from Massachusetts for 10 minutes, and me for 10 minutes following that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, may I ask that Senator OBAMA be recognized subsequent to that?

Mr. McCAIN. Fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I would like to be recognized as well in the ensuing sequence. My understanding is it has been going back and forth between the sides. The Senator from Connecticut spoke, and then the Senator from Maryland spoke. That caused us to have a little bit of a scheduling issue, so I would like to continue on that schedule and then allow myself to be recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask that the Senator from Florida be recognized following Senator OBAMA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request before the Chair is Senator KYL for 10 minutes, Senator KENNEDY for 10 minutes, Senator McCAIN for 10 minutes, Senator OBAMA for 15 minutes, and the Senator from Florida for 15 minutes.

Is there any objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2005

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2566, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2566) to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 2566) was read the third time and passed.

NOMINATION OF JOHN ROBERT BOLTON TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise in very strong support of John Bolton to be our next ambassador to the United Nations. I have known Mr. Bolton for a long time. He is a great individual, a great representative of the United States, and, most importantly, the person the President wants to represent the United States at the United Nations. It is the responsibility of the Senate to act on his nomination because the President has requested us to do so.

Mr. Bolton has successfully championed a number of multilateral initiatives during the time he has been working for the Bush administration. He is committed to the success of the United Nations and sees it as an important component of our diplomacy and is a strong voice for U.N. reform.

I am concerned that a lot of debate has shifted to matters that have nothing to do with his qualifications and some of which attempt to assassinate his character. There is no question he

is qualified for the job. In fact, Mr. Bolton has been confirmed by this body on four separate occasions previously. Most of the Members objecting to him now have voted for him in the past. They did so based upon his substantive views, not any allegations about his conduct.

A lot of it has to do with the fact that there is opposition to President Bush's policy in different regards, and Mr. Bolton's nomination is a surrogate, in effect, for a debate about that policy. We can have a debate about the President's foreign policy, but we should not hold up the nomination of a man with the qualifications of John Bolton for a position we need to fill in the process of having that debate.

Moreover, I am concerned about some of the charges that have been made about him. One of the allegations—the Senator from Connecticut was speaking about this—has to do with some requests Mr. Bolton made which have been examined by the Intelligence Committee. Mr. Bolton's job at the State Department is to deal with this kind of information, and what the Intelligence Committee did in response to the request of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was to look into the matter. Here is the response, on May 25, just quoting two paragraphs from the letter of the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee. He said:

After completing an examination of these issues I found no evidence that there was anything improper about any aspect of Mr. Bolton's requests for minimized identities of U.S. persons. I further found no violation of procedures, directives, regulations or law by Mr. Bolton. Moreover, I am not aware that anyone involved in handling these requests had any concerns regarding these requests at any point in the process.

The chairman of the Intelligence Committee also said:

Committee staff interviewed INR analysts and NSA officials responsible for processing requests for the identities of U.S. persons contained in signals intelligence products. None of the individuals interviewed indicated there was anything improper or inappropriate about Mr. Bolton's requests. We also were briefed by General Michael Hayden, former Director of the NSA and the current Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence. He also stated that Under Secretary Bolton's requests were not only appropriate, but routine. In fact, INR records indicate that since May 2001, INR submitted 489 other requests for minimized identities.

Ten, by the way, had been requested by Mr. Bolton.

So what Mr. Bolton did was routine and proper. There was nothing improper about it. As the chairman of the committee noted, they found absolutely nothing that would suggest anything improper in Mr. Bolton's activities. This is all a smokescreen. There is nothing there.

The last point on this matter had to do with the fact that the Senate, it is alleged, should have access to all of these names. This has nothing to do with Mr. Bolton's qualifications to be the U.S. Representative at the United

Nations. But there is some feeling that until Senators have access to these names, we should not act on the Bolton nomination.

Talk about a non sequitur, the Senate routinely does not have access to these names. They are highly classified. They get into the sources and methods of our intelligence. It is appropriate for certain people in the administration to gain access to the names, which is why, as is noted, there were 489 requests for those names by people within the administration—10 of which came from Mr. Bolton. There was nothing wrong with that.

As to whether Senators want access to these names, if that is something we need to take up with the intelligence community, the Intelligence Committee is entirely capable of doing that, but it has nothing to do with Mr. Bolton's qualifications to serve and our need to act on his nomination.

I suggest we cut through all of this smokescreen and get to the question of whether John Bolton is qualified to serve in the position the President would like to have him serve. That is the real question.

Let me note a couple of other things I am aware of that he has done in his position of Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

Probably the most significant and, frankly, one of the most significant achievements of the State Department itself in the last 4 years was John Bolton's initiative to develop the President's Proliferation Initiative. Over 60 countries are now participating in that initiative, and it is, frankly, one of the key reasons we disarmed Libya with its nuclear program.

John Bolton has played a key role in the implementation—creation and implementation—of the G-8 Global Partnership Against the Proliferation of WMD and WMD Materials. Under that program, we have doubled the size of the nonproliferation effort in the former Soviet Union by committing our G-8 partners to match our dollars with programs under the so-called Nunn-Lugar CTR effort.

He was instrumental in concluding U.N. Security Council Resolution 1540, which for the first time identifies proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as a threat to international peace and security—a resolution, by the way, that was adopted unanimously.

He has been a big advocate of U.N. reform. For example, while serving as Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, he detailed his concept of a "Unitary U.N." that sought to ensure management and budget reforms across the U.N. system, and that is something that is sorely needed. Almost everybody acknowledges that the U.N. needs this kind of reform today.

John Bolton is the guy who has worked tirelessly on this effort, including, by the way, the payment of arrearages in U.N. assessments that were cre-

ated during the 1980s. In that same capacity, he led the effort to repeal perhaps the most heinous resolution in U.N. history, the resolution equating Zionism with racism. He also served as a member of the Commission on Religious Freedom.

He has been there. He has fought on behalf of the United States. He has been an effective diplomat. Yes, he is a tough guy. People have noted that. Do we want a weak Representative at the United Nations? Especially today? I don't think so. President Bush is the person who has talked to all of these diplomats and Presidents and representatives of countries around the world. He has a good feel of what it takes at the United Nations now. None of us has the President's experience in knowing all these world leaders. The President has thought about this and said, knowing all these people, the way they act, how we use diplomacy at United Nations: I think the best guy to represent the United States at this point in time is my man John Bolton. He is the man I want to send there.

We ought to acknowledge that the President knows a little bit about foreign policy and foreign affairs, having worked with all these people, and probably has a pretty good idea of what it takes to get our country's interests represented well at the United Nations. John Bolton is the man he wants us to confirm in that position.

There are a variety of other things Mr. Bolton has worked on with respect to U.N. reform and efforts to reform the International Atomic Energy Agency and a variety of other items.

I will conclude by noting that we all appreciate the fact that the United Nations needs reform, and John Bolton is a person who can accomplish that reform. He has accomplished a great deal in the matter that is primarily of importance to us these days—the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the war on terror. I believe all the charges made against him have been answered, of course—they have been answered in spades—but we ought to move beyond all that smokescreen and get back to the central point, which is John Bolton is the man the President wants at the United Nations, he has been confirmed by this body four times before, there is no question about his qualifications and his desire, and the Senate needs to uphold the great tradition of this body by acting on—debating, certainly, but acting on the President's nominees and confirming John Bolton by 7 o'clock tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, would the Chair remind me when I have 2 minutes left, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is premature for this nomination even to be brought up before the Senate until we have the opportunity to see all the obviously relevant information on Mr. Bolton's record.

I want to congratulate our friends and colleagues, Senator BIDEN, Senator DODD, Senator KERRY, Senator SARBANES, and the other members of the committee, for the outstanding job they have done on this nomination.

The obvious conclusion from the administration's stonewalling is that the documents being withheld from the Senate contain nothing to support the nomination and will only make it even clearer that Mr. Bolton is the wrong choice for this extremely important position.

The United Nations is the world's preeminent diplomatic body. We need a representative there who is a strong and effective leader, who believes in diplomacy, and who has a proven record of using diplomacy to advance America's foreign policy and national security objectives.

Now more than ever, America needs to put our best face forward to the international community. We can—and should—do far better than John Bolton.

Jeane Kirkpatrick, who served as the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations under President Reagan, has spoken of the need to approach the job of U.N. ambassador in a "low key, quiet, persuasive and consensus-building way." As she says:

John Bolton may do diplomatic jobs for the U.S. government, but John is not a diplomat.

In fact, John Bolton is more a bully than a diplomat. His confirmation hearings suggest that on many occasions he twisted the intelligence to fit his views and wrongly pressured analysts to produce intelligence conclusions at odds with the facts. He continually sought to exaggerate the intelligence about Cuba's possible biological weapons activities and support for terrorism. He continually sought to exaggerate Syria's nuclear activities beyond what the intelligence analysts regarded as accurate. Rather than accept the analysis produced by the intelligence community, Mr. Bolton insisted on advancing his own views and retaliated against those who disagreed with him. He should be held accountable for this behavior, not rewarded and promoted.

The lessons of the Iraq war are abundantly clear. We need to make decisions based on facts and sound analysis of intelligence.

We need to encourage intelligence analysts to "speak truth to power" when intelligence is in danger of being distorted, manipulated, or misrepresented. We can't demand the results we want and try to fire people who refuse to go along. But that's precisely what Mr. Bolton repeatedly tried to do.

He tried to fire Christian Westermann a State Department intelligence analyst in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, who disputed the misleading language that Bolton tried to use about Cuba and biological weapons.

In another incident, the National Intelligence Officer for Latin America

had said that a speech by Mr. Bolton on Cuba did not accurately reflect the assessment of the intelligence community. So what did John Bolton do? He personally went to the CIA to try to have him fired.

Mr. Bolton's contempt for anyone with opposing views was not limited to intelligence officers who disagreed with him.

When two State Department officers in the nonproliferation Bureau disagreed over policy, he sought their removal.

He accused Rexon Ryu, a career civil servant, of intentionally withholding a cable on the U.N. inspection process in Iraq from his office. Nine months later, John Bolton denied Mr. Ryu a significant new assignment as the point person for the Nonproliferation Bureau for the upcoming G-8 summit.

In the case of a State Department lawyer, Mr. Bolton tried to remove him from a legal case on China sanctions, based on a misunderstanding of a position the lawyer had taken.

These are not isolated incidents of disgruntled employees. They represent a clear and troubling pattern of a bully who repeatedly tried to silence opposition by attempting to intimidate analysts and subordinates into conforming to his views.

Sadly, his view is not one that envisions a great and important role for the United Nations. On the contrary, Mr. Bolton has shown nothing but disdain for the United Nations. He has continued to articulate a vision of a go-it-alone foreign policy.

Speaking to the World Federalist Association in February 2004, he said:

There is no such thing as the United Nations. . . . There is an international community, that occasionally can be led by the only real power left in the world and that is the United States, when it suits our interest and when we can get others to go along.

He said:

The Secretariat building in New York has 38 stories. If you lost 10 stories today, it wouldn't make a bit of difference.

These are not the views of a person who is supposed to represent America's diplomatic interests in the international community. These are not the views of an individual who, as the Administration argues, is well suited to reform the United Nations.

These views are likely to make Mr. Bolton less effective, not more effective, pursuing our interests at the United Nations. We can't expect the support of other nations on issues that matter to the United States, if we show nothing but contempt for other nations.

In fact, on one highly important issue where diplomacy is desperately needed—North Korea—Mr. Bolton has been consistently wrong.

The nuclear threat from North Korea continues to grow. North Korea is already the greatest proliferator of ballistic missiles. Desperate, and strapped for cash, the threat is very real that North Korea could be a source of nuclear material for Al Qaeda terrorists.

We agreed to the Six-Party Talks, but have not effectively engaged the North Koreans. At Mr. Bolton's urging, our policy's been AWOL so far.

The results may be deadly. When President Bush came to office, North Korea's plutonium program was inactive. Its nuclear rods were under seal.

Then the President called North Korea part of his Axis of Evil. As we prepared for war with Iraq over nuclear weapons that did not exist, we learned that North Korea had begun a secret uranium enrichment program. When we confronted North Korea, but then refused to negotiate with it, North Korea expelled the international inspectors and began producing plutonium for nuclear weapons. On the eve of war with Iraq, North Korea pulled out of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

At the beginning of the Bush administration, North Korea was already thought to have two nuclear weapons. They are now believed to have up to eight such weapons—and possible more—and they may well be preparing for a nuclear test.

One of our worst national nightmares is nuclear material or even nuclear weapons in the hands of al Qaeda, with North Korea as their supplier.

The person guiding President Bush's policy on North Korea was John Bolton. His policy's been a failure, yet the administration now wants to promote him to be our Ambassador to the U.N.

Mr. Bolton was not able to advance effective diplomacy as Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security Affairs, and there is no reason to believe he can advance America's interests at the U.N.

The challenges facing America are serious—terrorism, war, ethnic conflict, ancient and modern rivalries, disease and poverty, human rights—all these are still the pressing daily realities—for peoples throughout the world.

The need for a strong United Nations as an effective international organization and a strong U.S. Ambassador to advance our interests is clear and compelling.

As Franklin Roosevelt said about America in 1945:

We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of nations far away We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community. It is not a Republican or Democratic or American community. It is a world community.

In the age of instant global communication, trade zones that span hemispheres, transnational criminal gangs, international terrorism, and the prospect of nuclear devastation—the need of nations to work together is greater than ever. The challenges we face today are too complex, too immense, and too pervasive for the United States or any nation to face alone.

The United Nations is the one and only organization through which the nations of the world can link their

unique strengths in a realistic hope of building a peaceful future for all humanity.

We need a representative at the United Nations who supports that vision and is committed to that future for us all. John Bolton is not the person for that job, and I urge my colleagues to vote against him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak again in support of John Bolton's confirmation as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. When I spoke in April in favor of Mr. Bolton, I highlighted a number of his qualities, including that he is smart, experienced, hard working, talented, and he knows the United Nations. In view of these and other impressive qualifications, the Senate has confirmed him four times in the past.

It is worth repeating several times: The Senate has done its work and confirmed him four times in the past.

In his current job as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, he has compiled a record of accomplishment. For example, next week marks the second anniversary of the Proliferation Security Initiative, a multilateral effort to stop trafficking of weapons of mass destruction and their components. John Bolton spearheaded this program since its inception, and today more than 60 countries support it. This success alone should disprove the argument that Mr. Bolton is somehow an arch unilateralist, bent on subverting collective international action.

The PSI is not his only multilateral success. He has also helped to construct the G-8's global partnership to secure dangerous technologies and materials. He led the negotiations leading to the Treaty of Moscow which dramatically reduced the size of deployed nuclear arsenals in the United States and Russia, and in his previous post as Assistant Secretary for International Organizations he led the successful drive to repeal the U.N. resolution equating Zionism with racism.

A lot has been made in recent weeks about Mr. Bolton's personal disposition in dealing with colleagues. Let's be frank: He is not a career diplomat either by profession or temperament, but then, the role of ambassador to the U.N. has always required something special. A look back at some of the personalities who have held this job—from Adlai Stevenson to Daniel Patrick Moynihan, from Jeane Kirkpatrick to Richard Holbrooke—shows that directness and forcefulness are assets, not hindrances, to effectiveness at the U.N.

We all know Mr. Bolton is perhaps not the world's most beloved manager nor one to keep his temper entirely under wraps. Perhaps I have a certain bias in that direction and an extra special sympathy because I am well known to my colleagues as always calm and never engaged in any controversial issues nor activities.

But seriously, I ask my colleagues, I ask seriously, is this unique to Mr. Bolton? If a temper and an unorthodox management style were disqualifiers from Government service, would that disqualify a lot of people, including maybe one or two in this body?

But the fact is, it is worth wondering not whether Mr. Bolton is a mild, gentle diplomat—we know he is not—but, rather, whether he is a representative we need at the United Nations. We need an ambassador who knows the U.N. We need an ambassador who is willing to shake up an organization that requires serious reform. Is there anyone in this Senate who does not believe the United Nations needs serious reform, an organization that has countries such as Sudan on its Human Rights Commission or whose General Assembly equates Zionism with racism?

We all know about the oil-for-food scandal that is unfolding now. We know there have been several calls for reform. One of my friends, Brent Scowcroft, served on a panel that was named by the Secretary General. And Kofi Annan has presented his own serious plan to implement these recommendations because the United Nations needs reform.

Why do I care so much? I care for a broad variety of reasons, including the fact that my taxpayer dollars support some 20 percent of the United Nations operations. The United Nations needs reform. The United Nations has failed in peacekeeping operations throughout the world. Some of the scandals concerning peacekeeping activities, of rape in the Congo, have got to be changed. The United Nations needs the presence of a tough, hard, dedicated individual who has been already confirmed in various posts four times by this Senate.

Elections have consequences. One consequence of President Bush's reelection is he has a right to appoint officials of his choice. I stress this because the President nominates. It is not my choice, or any other Senator's, but the President's choice. When President Clinton was elected, I didn't share the policy views of some of the officials he nominated, but I voted to confirm them, thinking that the President has a right to put into place the team he believes will serve him best.

The Foreign Relations Committee has spent weeks investigating Mr. Bolton's background. In his recent report on behalf of the committee majority, Senator LUGAR, one of the most respected individuals in this Nation, determined "the end result of all this is that Secretary Bolton emerged looking better than when it began." Chairman LUGAR ultimately concluded that Mr. Bolton is a highly qualified nominee. I agree.

In the last 48 hours or so I have noticed a change in the temperature around this body. I am very pleased about it. We realized it is time to move ahead with the people's business. It is

time we started addressing seriously the energy crisis in this country. It is time we got together, along with the President, in coming together to save Social Security. It is time we move forward with the Defense authorization bill and help the men and women who are defending this Nation and sacrificing as we speak.

I strongly urge my friends on the other side of the aisle, we are going to have a cloture vote this evening. After that, let's vote up or down. For my colleagues who disagree and do not want Mr. Bolton there, I respect their views. But let's go ahead and give him an up-or-down vote before we go into recess for a week. Let him go. If the Senate in its wisdom approves of his nomination, let's go ahead and let him get to work rather than wait a week or 10 days or more. We have been at this for weeks. Let's move on to other things.

If we asked our constituents, What would you like us to do, take up the Defense authorization bill? Take up an energy bill? Try to work on this deficit problem that is mortgaging their futures? Sit down and negotiate a bipartisan agreement on Social Security? Those would be their priorities. Let's move ahead tonight, have the cloture vote, have a vote on Mr. Bolton, and move forward and plan for when we come back from the recess, addressing the issues that are important to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, let me begin my statement today by outlining what I think this debate is not about.

I do not believe this debate is about Mr. Bolton being rude on occasion. This debate is not about Mr. Bolton being blunt. The debate is not about Mr. Bolton occasionally losing his temper.

As the distinguished Senator from Arizona just noted, if this is the criteria, many of us in the U.S. Senate would not be qualified to serve in a position that requires confirmation. Almost all of us lose our cool from time to time and say things we come to regret later. Let me add, I don't think this debate is about whether Mr. Bolton is an intelligent man.

These are not the issues at the heart of the strong bipartisan objections that have been voiced on this nomination.

The crux of the objections is very specific, very credible allegations that Mr. Bolton sought to shade intelligence and sideline career intelligence analysts who did not agree with his policy views. This is the core of the bipartisan objections to this nomination.

Over and over again, we heard from a range of career officials and Bush administration appointees that Mr. Bolton sought to massage intelligence to fit an ideological bias. Let me emphasize, these are objections coming forward from Bush appointees.

In addition, we have 102 former ambassadors and senior diplomats who oppose Bolton—from the Nixon administration, the Ford administration, and

that bastion of fuzzy-headed liberalism, the Reagan administration.

In an environment where reliable intelligence is one of the best tools we have to keep us safe, we must heed the lessons from the Iraq war: Intelligence must never be shaped to fit policy views. Dissent within the intelligence community should not be muzzled or suppressed; it should be respected and encouraged.

The United States Senate should be sending a clear, unequivocal statement to our intelligence officers: We want you to play it straight and call it like you see it—even if it is something we do not want to hear.

I am afraid that by voting to confirm Mr. Bolton, we will fail to send that critical message.

Now, I believe the President is entitled to the benefit of the doubt when appointing senior members of his team. To that end, I have supported a number of the President's choices for top foreign policy positions, including Secretary Rice; Robert Zoellick, to be her deputy; and Nick Burns, to fill the third-ranking position at the State Department.

I think we should provide some deference to the President. The executive branch is primarily responsible for the day-to-day operations of our foreign policy.

At the same time, the Constitution gives the Senate the power to advise and to consent. This is a responsibility I take very seriously.

And so, because of Mr. Bolton's consistent breach of the line between practicing politics and analyzing intelligence—that is pivotal to our national security—I intend to vote “no” on the nomination of John Bolton to be our representative to the United Nations.

I agree with much of what my colleagues have said about the problems with Mr. Bolton's qualifications to serve in this position. But I would like to focus on one issue that I believe has not been covered in great detail—Mr. Bolton's performance in his current job.

It has been suggested we should overlook the troubling aspects of Mr. Bolton's record—the fact that he appears to have attempted to manipulate intelligence data; the fact he does not appear to have been entirely forthcoming before the Foreign Relations Committee; and the fact we still cannot get basic information from the State Department on his nomination—for one reason: because Mr. Bolton is so competent for the job. I have heard this argument repeatedly from the other side of the aisle.

I am baffled by this reasoning. I am stupefied by the suggestion that Mr. Bolton is such an excellent choice for the job, so uniquely qualified for this job, that we should just ignore all of these other problems.

When I look at the record of Mr. Bolton during the last 4 years as the top arms control and nonproliferation official at the State Department, I am

not impressed. Let's look at his track record.

On North Korea, the approach that has been advocated by both Mr. Bolton and this administration has simply not worked. Under Mr. Bolton's watch, there are no longer international inspectors and cameras at any site in North Korea. The North Koreans have withdrawn from the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We now believe North Korea has developed material for six to eight nuclear weapons.

When North Korea has one or two nuclear weapons, the situation is critical. They can test one weapon, and hold one weapon. When it has six to eight, the situation is terminal. North Korea can now test a weapon, hold a couple, and sell the rest. And we know that North Korea will do virtually anything for the money.

Another area Mr. Bolton was responsible for is the Non-Proliferation Treaty, a critical tool for helping to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to rogue states, which could ultimately fall into the hands of terrorist organizations.

President Bush recognized the importance of the NPT and pledged to strengthen this treaty in a 2004 speech at the National Defense University. A week later, Mr. Bolton promised to do the same.

What has happened since? Virtually nothing. The administration has made very little progress on this issue, and the Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference currently underway is not going well.

An article from MSNBC reports:

The United States has been losing control of the conference's agenda this week to Iran and other countries, a potentially serious setback to U.S. efforts to isolate Tehran.

Where has Mr. Bolton been throughout this process?

According to the same article:

[S]ince last fall Bolton, Mr. Bush's embattled nominee to be America's ambassador to the United Nations, has aggressively lobbied for a senior job in the second Bush administration. During that time Mr. Bolton did almost no diplomatic groundwork for the NPT conference . . . officials say. Everyone knew the conference was coming, and that it would be contentious, says a former senior Bush official, but Bolton stopped all diplomacy on this six months ago.

In other words, Mr. Bolton was more interested in lobbying for the U.N. job than doing the tough groundwork necessary for a successful review conference.

Let's turn to Iran—another issue on which Mr. Bolton should have been working to formulate a coherent, workable administration strategy. Instead, the administration's policy has been all over the map. In a hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee last week, a senior State Department official described the latest iteration of the Administration's policy as a “patient policy.”

I would say the policy has been less about patience and more about paralysis—a dangerous situation for a na-

tion such as Iran that is developing nuclear weapons, is a state sponsor of terrorism, and is meddling in Iraq.

Perhaps this paralysis and incoherence is best illustrated by the fact that since 2001, the administration has tried—to my knowledge, without success—to formulate a Presidential Directive on Iran. As the top non-proliferation official at the State Department, Mr. Bolton should have been doing more to shape a workable policy instead of letting it drift dangerously along for the last 4 years.

Mr. President, I know my time is running short, so let me conclude with a couple of simple points.

Two examples are frequently cited by Mr. Bolton and his supporters as evidence of his success and competence in his current position: Libya and the Proliferation Security Initiative. During his confirmation hearings, Mr. Bolton touted these successes over and over again.

Now, I agree with Mr. Bolton that we have made important progress on these issues. But reports suggest that the Libya deal was struck in spite of Mr. Bolton, not because of him. In fact, Mr. Bolton was sidelined from the negotiations by the White House. And, the British Government specifically asked that Mr. Bolton not play a role in this process.

I quote from an MSNBC article that specifically addresses this issue:

Bolton, for instance, often takes and is given credit for the administration's Proliferation Security Initiative, an agreement to interdict suspected WMD shipments on the high seas, and the deal to dismantle Libya's nuclear program, a deal that Bolton, by the way, had sought to block. But [a] former senior Bush official . . . says that, in fact, Bolton's successor, Robert Joseph deserves most of the credit for these achievements. This official adds that it was Joseph who was in charge of counterproliferation at the NSC [and] who had to pitch in when Bolton fumbled preparations for the NPT conference as well.

Now, here is my point: If there was clear evidence that Mr. Bolton is a terrific diplomat, maybe I could understand how some in the Senate could overlook what I consider to be a mountain of evidence concerning his misuse of intelligence and say: You know what, this guy is such a capable administrator and diplomat, we need him to reform the United Nations.

I would still believe that the misuse of intelligence, in and of itself, disqualifies Mr. Bolton from the job, but at least I could understand why some people would draw such a conclusion.

But the record indicates that in his current job he has not had much success, which leads me to ask: Why is it we are so confident this is the person who is going to lead reform in the United Nations?

The distinguished Senator from Arizona is exactly right, we need reform in the United Nations. It is inexcusable some of the things that go on up there.

But as a consequence of Mr. Bolton's diminished credibility and stature, I

think he is exactly the opposite of what we need at the United Nations. Countries such as Zimbabwe and Burma, and others that do not want to see reform take place at the UN, are going to be able to dismiss our efforts at reform by saying: Mr. Bolton is a U.N. basher, someone who is ideologically opposed to the existence of the U.N.—thereby using Mr. Bolton's own words and lack of credibility as a shield to prevent the very reforms that need to take place.

Moreover, I have yet to hear a comprehensive plan from Mr. Bolton or the administration for U.N. reform.

So let me close by saying this: When the Foreign Relations Committee considered Mr. Bolton's nomination, I invoked the memory of Adlai Stevenson, a great citizen of the State of Illinois. Stevenson had the credibility, the temperament, and the diplomatic skill to guide the United States through some of the worst, most difficult times at the United Nations—especially the Cuban missile crisis.

During this crisis, we were able to isolate the Soviets because of the stature and integrity of our permanent representative to the United Nations.

Given the issues that have surfaced surrounding Mr. Bolton's nomination, I simply ask my colleagues this: If a crisis were to occur with North Korea or Iran, are we sure the integrity and credibility of Mr. Bolton would command the respect of the rest of the world? Would Mr. Bolton, like Adlai Stevenson, be able to convince the world that our intelligence and our policies are right and true? Would Mr. Bolton be able to isolate our enemies and build a coalition that would ultimately make our troops safer and our mission easier?

I believe the answer is no. There are some wonderful, capable, tough, conservative, reform-minded Republican diplomats who are well qualified for this task and would easily be confirmed by the Senate. Mr. Bolton is not one of them.

I would urge that the other side of the aisle seriously consider their position on this nomination. I hope we can muster the votes to send this nomination back to the President. Let's start afresh. I know we can do better.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I rise to strongly support the nomination of John Bolton to be the United States next permanent representative to the United Nations. I do so because I believe this is a man of great integrity who has dedicated himself to serve this Nation in various different posts over the course of his life.

I want to try hard not to repeat a lot of what has been said already because it is, I know, at times repetitious. But I do believe it is important we recognize and know this gentleman has been previously confirmed by the Senate in four prior Presidential appointments,

and three of those in the area of diplomacy.

I am intrigued by the comments of the Senator from Illinois about Mr. Bolton's diminished stature. It appears that now we are going to find him unqualified by what has transpired over the last 60 days to this good man, as his record has been trashed repeatedly, oftentimes with scant or little evidence.

So let me say I believe this is a good man who has earned the right and has been chosen by the President of the United States to represent our Nation at this very important post.

The Senator from Arizona spoke about elections having consequences. The fact is, President Bush not only has made this choice but has made a choice of someone who he believes is the right person to lead our efforts at this time at the United Nations.

Mr. Bolton is someone who has sometimes been called blunt speaking. At the same time, our President at times has irked people because of the directness of his language, because of the fact that sometimes he calls a spade a spade. I do recall, as a member of his Cabinet, sitting in a joint session of the Congress when a great deal of talk was generated about him speaking about an "axis of evil." The President has chosen this direct man to be at the United Nations, and at a time when we need direct talk. There is a great tradition at the United Nations of people who have been plain spoken.

I have had the pleasure and honor of knowing Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick. No one has ever suggested that Ambassador Kirkpatrick was shy, retiring or unclear about her views. I also had the honor of knowing someone who was ambassador to the United Nations, Vernon Walters. I know Vernon Walters embarked on many diplomatic missions, usually to set the record straight with some foreign leader, usually to tell him bluntly what needed to be done or said. If there is any doubt about that, there is a wonderful book he wrote about his life called "Silent Missions" that provides good evidence.

We hold up Adlai Stevenson as someone who should be emulated. The fact is, Ambassador Stevenson, who was a wonderful public servant as well, at times used rather blunt language. I can remember as a child being glued to the TV set during the missile crisis with Cuba and the Soviet Union, and Adlai Stevenson demanding: Don't wait for the translation. He was prepared to use blunt language. It is in our national interest, at times, to have direct, blunt-speaking people, particularly at a place like the United Nations.

We have heard, in the course of the debate, that Mr. Bolton should not be qualified for this job because he spoke of the fact that out of the 38 stories at the U.N. building, perhaps 10 could be done away with. Who here does not, in a serious way, believe that the United Nations bureaucracy could use some streamlining? More interesting than

that, Mr. Bolton has been speaking about this for over a decade. He wrote some very interesting articles, which I took the time to read, about United Nations reform, about streamlining that bureaucracy, about better budgetary management. Sadly, although his writings are 8 or 10 years old, even longer, little has been done to move the ball forward, to change that stymied bureaucracy that continues not to use taxpayer dollars appropriately and who has engaged in some condemnable practices in recent days.

One of the charges I find most unfair—and its repetition does not add to its credibility—is the charge that Mr. Bolton has politicized intelligence, has massaged intelligence, has not used intelligence adequately. There is no evidence, for those of us who sat in the Foreign Relations Committee meetings and heard the evidence of those who spoke, that Mr. Bolton ever massaged intelligence. There is evidence that Mr. Bolton acted swiftly to try to explain to those who worked for him how they should approach the clearance of his speeches. And he did react strongly to those who tried to go around him and attempted to impact or influence that which would be clear for him to say.

It is, in fact, at times difficult to study intelligence and analyze it in a way that gives it clear and complete clarity. So what do we do? We have intelligence analysts. We have human beings who are, similar to historians and journalists and all of us in life, given to the proclivities of their own bias, their own life experience, their own political views. Through that filter, comes the intelligence which comes not in a clear package but as a mosaic, something that comes in bits and pieces and dribs and drabs. Out of that, we have to make a whole cloth. We have to create a judgment. That is where judgment comes in.

Those who are in politically appointed positions have the responsibility to challenge the professionals in the intelligence community as they seek to put together the ultimate judgments about what the pieces of information tell them concerning the truth of that intelligence.

In that instance, at times, maybe Mr. Bolton has had differences, but in every single instance that could be overturned—and believe me, his record has been combed carefully—there was never a time when Mr. Bolton went outside that which was approved and that which was cleared.

It is important to me that the record be clear about Mr. Bolton's statements on the issue of bioweapons capabilities by Cuba. In his speech at the Heritage Foundation, which has caused so much controversy and interest, he used the very same language that 3 months earlier one of his accusers, Carl Ford, had used before a Senatorial committee. That language, which stands to this day, reads:

The United States believes that Cuba has at least a limited developmental offensive biological warfare research and development

effort. Cuba has provided dual use bio-technology to rogue states. We're concerned that such technology could support [bioweapons] programs in those states. We call on Cuba to cease all [bioweapons] applicable cooperation with rogue states and to fully comply with all its obligations under the Biological Weapons Convention.

I believe those are responsible remarks. I believe those are timely remarks. I believe those are remarks that are intended to make the world safer and to make America safer from terrorism by bioweapons. Sharing bioweapons technology with rogue states is not a good thing. The fact that Mr. Bolton would dare to call their hand on it is not a bad thing. We should be grateful to Mr. Bolton for his directness, for his bluntness, for his willingness to take on this issue and speak about it clearly.

It has also been said that Mr. Bolton may not have done a good job at his last assignment. I repeat, again, that this is the fourth time the Senate, after a Presidential appointment, has sought to confirm Mr. Bolton, most recently as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

A number of states around the world pose great danger and concern. We spoke about Cuba. It is one of those. But there is also Iran. As to Iran, on Under Secretary Bolton's watch, Iran's formerly covert nuclear program has been exposed and has been described in detail in seven public reports by the IAEA director general. The IAEA board of directors has adopted six resolutions calling on Iran to suspend its nuclear fuels cycle activities and fully cooperate with IAEA inspections.

The EU—particularly UK, France, and Germany—the United States, and Russia are working closely to suspend and reverse Iran's nuclear program and to develop a complete absence of any further nuclear testing by them. Today we had some encouraging news. We hope we can build on that. That is a success that, in no small measure, is due to Mr. Bolton's work.

In addition, we have talked about North Korea. I find it terribly interesting that the irrational behavior of the North Korean Government, which we all know to be irrational and unconventional, would be laid at the feet of this nominee. North Korea has had nuclear aspirations for decades. And it began an active effort to acquire nuclear weapons years before the Bush administration came into office, years before Mr. Bolton was in the position he holds. The 1994 agreed framework was doomed to fail and was only a short-term Band-Aid to the resolution of this problem. It was akin to looking down a soda straw and at a plutonium facility and ignoring the fact that North Korea began cheating, almost as the ink was drying, by embarking on a covert uranium enrichment program. The Bush administration changed tracks. The Bush administration took a different policy approach.

I understand there may be some on the other side of the aisle who disagree

with that policy approach, and much has been said about that. In fact, in the Presidential debate, there was discussion of this very issue. Again, elections have consequences. President Bush's approach to proceeding with the six-party approach to negotiations with North Korea is what is continuing today.

We cannot blame Mr. Bolton for those instances where foreign policy issues have not gone as we wished and then refuse to give him credit for those that have been successful. That is the height of unfairness and the height of hypocrisy.

In Libya, our policies have met with success. Negotiations on Libya's weapons of mass destruction dismantling effort were conducted at a senior level by the CIA and White House negotiators. Mr. Bolton was not a part of that process, as often is the case for diplomats. I can recall a distinguished ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, when President Kennedy received information, with photographs by our reconnaissance airplanes, that there were offensive missiles hidden in Cuba. Adlai Stevenson did not have that information. We know now, from the books that have been written about that, he was highly offended that he was not included in or given that information until later when it had been made public. The fact is, sometimes diplomacy has to be conducted in serious and closed circles. Mr. Bolton successfully oversaw WMD dismantling and removal from Libya.

In addition, I believe there have been a number of other unfair accusations about Mr. Bolton's conduct in terms of his relationship with subordinates.

The fact is, some of these allegations have been found to be completely devoid of any merit. In fact, the majority report on the Melody Townsel case—one of those that was so sensational, that caused the Foreign Relations Committee to defer consideration of his nomination until 3 weeks later—the investigation on page 315 of the report says:

The investigation was not able to establish conclusively that the alleged events even occurred.

The fact is that, along with many of these other allegations that have really nothing to do with the qualifications and competence of Mr. Bolton, has been found to be either without merit or with very little merit.

Mr. President, in conclusion, it is time that we move forward with this good man's nomination. I find it, as a fairly new Member of the Senate, a little disturbing and disappointing how easily and with little hard evidence a person's reputation can be tarnished. The fact is, there have been bits and pieces that were either exaggerated or simply not found to have merit that have been now utilized to try to derail this good man's nomination.

I look forward to Mr. Bolton's service at the U.N. I think he will be a good and effective reformer in an institution

that is in desperate need of reform and an institution where he has taken the time, over the history of his work, to talk about those issues of reform—management reform and budgetary reform.

Our Nation contributes a very sizable percentage of the U.N. budget. It is our taxpayer dollars that are being wasted at the U.N. and that are oftentimes not only not serving our national interests but are, in fact, harming our national interests.

We have a person with Mr. Bolton's experience, and it has been suggested that he is someone who is simply not going to be effective at the U.N., and he is not going to be effective because it keeps being repeated that he will not be effective there.

Mr. Bolton has a strong record of accomplishment. I point to the repeal of the Zionism as racism resolution, on which Mr. Bolton led the effort that was so important in establishing a dynamic paradigm so the Middle Eastern peace process could move forward, so that fundamental fairness toward Israel could also prevail at the U.N., a place that has been so incredibly harsh on Israel and its right to exist.

I am delighted and it is with great pleasure that I support the nomination of John Bolton to be the next Permanent Representative at the U.N.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the nomination of John Bolton to be ambassador to the United Nations.

There are two issues at stake. First is an issue of whether this Senate will receive critical information so that we can deliberate carefully and thoroughly about Mr. Bolton's nomination. So far, the State Department, as my colleagues, Senators DODD and BIDEN, pointed out, failed to provide information under the theory that they get to decide what we should know when we are casting a vote as important as ambassador to the United Nations. It is a novel theory, but it holds no water. If we allow this to go on, it will make the Senate irrelevant when it comes to major decisions about nominations and major decisions about the future policy of the country.

The second issue is the qualifications of Mr. Bolton to be ambassador to the United Nations. For me, this is not a particularly hard vote. I opposed Mr. Bolton's nomination to be Assistant Secretary for Arms Control. That was based upon my review of his record, his statements, and his commitment to arms control and counterproliferation. Frankly, I think over the last several years—the record is mixed, but in large part it suggests that his duties there certainly don't warrant a promotion to be ambassador to the U.N.

He was instrumental in establishing the Proliferation Security Initiative, which is a potentially useful framework, but as CRS pointed out:

Without greater resources, legal authority or technical tools for interdiction, the success of PSI may rest on a political commitment of like-minded states to follow through.

In a sense, after all of the initial hype, there does not appear to be the followthrough necessary to make this work. That was on Mr. Bolton's watch.

He also negotiated the 2002 Moscow Treaty, but this is an interesting arms control treaty. It has no verification regime. There is no requirement for either side to make adjustments in the status of nuclear weapons until the last day of the treaty, which is years from now. It has no provisions for continuing negotiations. Again, more style than substance, more press release than real progress.

Secretary Rice has indicated that Mr. Bolton was involved in negotiations which led to a significant breakthrough—the renunciation of nuclear weapons by the Government of Libya. However, if you listen to British officials participating in the negotiations, they requested that the White House take Mr. Bolton off the negotiating team because he was undermining their potential for success.

While Mr. Bolton was an Under Secretary for State for Arms Control, the United States withdrew from the ABM Treaty, becoming the first nation since World War II to withdraw from a major international security agreement.

Mr. Bolton also blocked efforts to add a verification clause to the Bio-weapons Convention, blocked negotiations in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament with respect to the weaponization of space, and worked to weaken a treaty on small arms trafficking.

That is not the record of somebody who is an Arms Control Under Secretary committed to ending proliferation. If you look at North Korea, when he took over, they had, at most, two nuclear weapons. Now, North Korea may have as many as eight—four times the peril and danger. That is not a record that compels a promotion.

I think this is a situation in which other factors have come into play—assertions and allegations that he has pushed the envelope with respect to intelligence, about threats from Syria and other countries. Again, this is not a record that deserves promotion, a record of someone who is in a challenging world and is able to make a major, positive difference with respect to arms control, and it reflects the administration's disdain for the process of arms control and counter-proliferation.

Now Mr. Bolton has been nominated to be ambassador to the U.N. And once again, Mr. Bolton is reflecting the administration—this time their disdain for the U.N. I believe that is wrong.

We should have recognized, after our experience in Iraq, that we cannot go it alone. As unpleasant as international organizations can be sometimes, as inefficient and unworkable as they are at

times, in the long run we are better when we ally with other nations than striking out alone. Mr. Bolton has a different view of the U.N.

In 1994, he stated:

There is no such thing as the United Nations. . . . If the U.N. Secretariat Building in New York lost 10 stories, it wouldn't make a bit of difference.

That is a narrowed-minded view and not historical. The U.N. has made a difference.

Repeatedly, Mr. Bolton talked about his disdain for the U.N. In 1998, he was responding to the ramifications of not paying U.N. dues. In his words:

Not only do I not care about losing the General Assembly vote, but actually see it as a "make my day" outcome.

That is not the kind of cavalier attitude that will bode him well as ambassador to the United Nations, where he becomes one of the chief diplomats in our diplomatic arsenal, if you will.

In an article in the New York Times, Elizabeth Jones stated:

I don't know if he's incapable of negotiation, but he's unwilling.

Ms. Jones believed that:

"The fundamental problem," if Mr. Bolton were to become U.N. ambassador, would be a reluctance on his part to make the kinds of minor, symbolic concessions necessary to build consensus among other governments and maintain the American position.

In another view by Jeane Kirkpatrick, former U.S. ambassador to the U.N. and referred to by my colleague from Florida, she stated:

John Bolton may do diplomatic jobs in the U.S. Government, but John is not a diplomat.

Frankly, the role of ambassador requires a diplomat, not someone who is an intellectual bully, not someone who is there to make a point and not to make progress, not someone there to send a message, to deride the work of his colleagues at the U.N.

So I think we have a responsibility on two fronts: First, to assert rather strongly that we are relevant to this process, that we need information, and that executive agencies do not decide what information we need. And second, Mr. Bolton's record to date, his statements to date, his attitude to date suggest he will not be an effective ambassador to the United Nations. As a result, I urge that his nomination be opposed.

Mr. President, I yield back my time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise to offer to my colleagues my strong and unequivocal support for John Bolton and his nomination to be our United States representative to the United Nations.

John Bolton was picked by the President. A President ought to be able to bring people into his administration, men and women, who share the values, the aspirations, the goals, of that administration. This President also represents the views of most Americans who believe the United Nations needs reforming. We need to bring someone into that position to get those reforms done.

I believe very strongly John Bolton is exceptionally well-qualified for this task. This is a time of change, a time of improvement that is necessary for the United Nations.

During the protracted committee process, we saw all sorts of sensationalized charges and outright fabrications against John Bolton. His nomination nonetheless, has finally reached the Senate where I am sure my colleagues will see the wisdom in confirming John Bolton. This debate provides an opportunity to have a full discussion on John Bolton and his qualifications to serve as Ambassador to the United Nations.

What has been lost in this entire debate from the very beginning as they are off on tangents, detours, and all sorts of allegations. What is being missed—and what I hope my colleagues and the American people will focus on—is the dire need for change in the United Nations. The need for accountability, the need for scrutiny, the need for reform.

In testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee and in interviews conducted by the committee staff, there is almost no mention, or discussion, of what needs to be done to reform the United Nations. John Bolton is a man with the skill, wisdom, principles, and the right person to unflinchingly lead those changes as our representative.

Much of the debate during the committee consideration and some of the things that have been said in the Senate has been focused on the sensibilities of some who are apparently easily offended. There is a fascination with speech crafting. For example, there is concern over what Mr. Bolton said at a speech to the Heritage Foundation concerning Cuba's biological weapons program and how that might be shared with rogue nations.

The reality is, and I will quote this for the record so if anyone wants to see what was actually said that created this controversy. What was actually said is the following by John Bolton at the Heritage Foundation in the speech "Beyond the Axis of Evil," May 6, 2002:

Here is what we now know. The United States believes that Cuba has at least a limited offensive biological warfare research and development effort. Cuba has provided dual-use biotechnology to other rogue states. We are concerned that such technology could support biological weapons programs in those states. We call on Cuba to cease all biological weapons applicable cooperation with rogue states and to fully comply with all of its obligations under the Biological Weapons Convention.

Well, one of the people, a very cheerful fellow, Carl Ford, complained about the sensibilities of some staff person. Here is what he said in testimony to the Foreign Relations Committee. He said:

The United States believes that Cuba has at least a limited developmental offensive biological warfare research and development effort. Cuba has provided dual use biotechnology to rogue states. We are concerned that such technology could support biological weapons programs in those states. We call on Cuba to cease all biological weapons applicable cooperation with rogue states and to fully comply with all its obligations under the Biological Weapons Convention.

Mr. President, I see you are squinting and trying to probably figure out: Well, what is the difference? There is no difference. It is the same in the speech as was the testimony from Mr. FORD in the Foreign Relations Committee. Then, we hear from folks talking about: Oh, people were upset because of all of this concern on how this speech was constructed. Well, here is the reality. The whole process was one in which the person who was clearing this language did some things that were inappropriate. An e-mail from Thomas Fingar to Thomas Bolton stated the following:

I looked at what my guy sent to the IC and that won't happen again . . . Choice of the phrase "does not concur" was entirely inappropriate . . . we have no role whatsoever in determining how you or any policymaker says what you want to say beyond suggesting alternatives that we think might be cleared more readily than what has been drafted if time was of the essence and the drafter asked for such advice.

The bottom line, he ends it:

We screwed it up, but for base reasons. It won't happen again.

So John Bolton had a reason to be concerned about how some things went around through the loops and so forth. The reality is, as many individuals, our colleagues, fellow Senators, particularly on the Foreign Relations Committee—in recent months, once John Bolton had been nominated for this position—were talking about how he was rude maybe, or irascible with some staff, or concerned about this, that, or the other. Things that have supposedly come up in recent years, of course, each and every one of these allegations have been refuted and the truth has come forth.

The reality is that when John Bolton was proposed and nominated to be Under Secretary of State, back in 2001, Senators BIDEN, BOXER, KERRY, DODD, and SARBANES—all of them—voted against John Bolton. That was even before they knew about these tangential issues.

Now, I would prefer, when looking at the United Nations, we would be, as a country, united in making sure we pursue the abuse and anti-Americanism that pervades the United Nations. Rather than get off on these tangential and unfounded charges, I am much more concerned about the United Nations being used as a front for dictator-

ships and terrorists, as well as being a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Over the last year, we have witnessed scandal after scandal in the United Nations. Unfortunately, these are not issues that can be addressed by a few marginal changes. These are issues that have shaken the credibility of the United Nations and caused many citizens in the United States, and people around the world, to really wonder whether the U.N. has any relevance in the future or has a redeeming role in world affairs.

Now, the United Nations was founded on: faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person.

While the United Nations performs a number of admirable endeavors, it is also beholden to tyrants, dictators, and repressive regimes in certain circumstances. Not considering the scandals, this is an organization that has allowed some of the world's worst violators of human rights to chair its Commission on Human Rights. Just when the United States has made a commitment to the spread of freedom and justice throughout the world, it is difficult for Americans—I know in Virginia, in North Carolina, and elsewhere around this country—to see the United Nations as anything other than wasting their tax dollars. When a country such as Libya is chairing the Human Rights Commission. Sudan is on the Human Rights Commission, and within the last several weeks, Zimbabwe has been made a member of the Commission. This is certainly not an indication that the Secretary General's call for reform of the Commission on Human Rights is at all being heeded.

Now, as public servants and stewards of the American taxpayers' dollars, we need to make sure the revenues we allocate are being put to good use. The United States and the people of this country, the taxpayers, every single year, are providing \$2 billion to the United Nations. We will provide over 22 percent of the U.N.'s regular budget in 2005.

I believe all Americans want reforms enacted that would prevent future abuses in programs like the Oil-for-Food Program, where Saddam Hussein and his thugs skimmed off \$20 billion. I think we also, as Americans, want to hold accountable U.N. peacekeepers who commit crimes against children. We have an obligation to work with like-minded reformers in the U.N. to make sure policies are implemented to prevent similar abuses in the future.

Now, reform is absolutely necessary in the United Nations. The United Nations is in a crisis, and the United States has a strong interest in seeing it emerge as a credible and relevant institution once again. The U.N. Security Council and International Atomic Energy Agency, otherwise known as IAEA, are needed forums for discussing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the actions that need to be taken, not just by the United States but with

our European and other allies around the world, to make sure that rogue nations do not acquire those nuclear weapons.

We have seen in recent years that the United Nations can provide an important role in helping the spread of democracy. They can be helpful in rebuilding societies that are emerging from decades of tyranny and repression.

The United Nations has a role to play in the future of global affairs and security, but it can only do so if it takes serious steps to reform the extraordinary corruption and ineptitude that has plagued it in recent years.

Now, John Bolton comes to this nomination with a broad and deep knowledge of international affairs. From his early days as General Counsel at the U.S. Agency for International Development during the Ronald Reagan administration, to his most recent post as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Affairs, Mr. Bolton has spent a great deal of time working on advancing the interests of the United States and our foreign policy.

Some have wrongly criticized John Bolton as a rigid unilateralist who is incapable of building consensus with allies. However, his years of service prove otherwise.

On counterproliferation, Mr. Bolton's efforts gave life and actual meaning to President Bush's Proliferation Security Initiative. Under John Bolton's leadership, a dangerous gap in counterproliferation enforcement on the seas has been filled by international cooperation and information sharing. Sixty countries were brought together. That is not working alone. He understands, if we are going to interdict weapons of mass destruction, biological weapons, nuclear or otherwise, we do need the support of other countries.

In addition, Mr. Bolton helped create the Global Partnership at the G-8 summit in Alberta, Canada, in 2002. This partnership doubled the size of the non-proliferation effort in the former Soviet Union by committing our G-8 partners to match the United States' \$1 billion per year Cooperative Threat Reduction or Nunn-Lugar program.

He also played a central role in negotiating the Treaty of Moscow, which will reduce operationally deployed nuclear weapons by two-thirds.

Elimination of North Korea's nuclear threat still requires much hard work, but it is clear that the half century stalemate that has allowed the North Koreans to steal or develop nuclear arms technology is over. Growing pressure is on that dictatorship, and John Bolton's role at the State Department in creating it are being confirmed by the torrent of personal invective directed at him from the North Korean Government.

While our Ambassador there might have had his sensibilities offended by John Bolton calling the North Korean regime a "repressive dictatorship,"

which seems to be accurate, as well as saying it is a "hellish nightmare" for people to have to live in. North Korea, which I might not have used the first word, but it is certainly a nightmare, it seems to me to be very accurate description.

Of course, some have criticized John Bolton for doing that. And gosh, the North Koreans called him "human scum." I am going to stand with John Bolton in his characterization of North Korea. In fact, they say of John Bolton: Oh, this was not helpful for him to be calling North Korea or characterizing it as it is.

He helped break a long international silence, while there are some who think, when you are dealing with a repressive dictatorship, the best thing to do is just be quiet, calm them down, try to coordinate them into a corner, pet them, don't get them agitated, and maybe they will just change on their own. Maybe there are those who think you can have editorials in newspapers and that is going to matter to tyrants and dictatorships. They don't care about public opinion. They don't care about human rights. All they care about is power and staying in power.

So John Bolton, in my view, performed a valuable service in breaking this long international silence about the suffering of the people in North Korea. For too long, savage conditions, condemned by food aid workers, and glimpsed by visitors to the North, received very little, very scant world attention. By magnifying the human dimension of the North Korean problem, his work may hasten the day when these abhorrent human rights violations in North Korea will end. The reality for North Korea is that we need the Chinese. The South Koreans, the Japanese, and the Russians are all very important but as a practical matter the ones who really prop up that regime is the Government of the People's Republic of China.

When people are allowed to escape from North Korea, what happens? They get to some embassy in China and they get sent back to North Korea. Guess what happens? They get tortured and in some cases they get killed. We need to make sure that if somebody can get out of that regime—just as if someone could have gotten out of East Germany or Czechoslovakia or Hungary or Poland; if they somehow could get out of those countries and escape to Austria, to West Germany, to the Netherlands, to Denmark, we certainly would not say: Go on back in there and let the East German police take care of you or let the Soviet puppets in the Eastern Bloc take care of you.

So, I think John Bolton has done a great job in pointing out the human rights violations in North Korea. Some may also not agree with his forthright critique of the United Nations and its failings. I think Mr. Bolton has clearly placed a great deal of thought into his views, and he can work with the United Nations' bureaucracy. But he is not

going to be a lapdog. He is not going to get seduced by niceties. He is going to say: This is what needs to be done.

As Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations—and this is, indeed, working with the United Nations—John Bolton—and you can read what Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger wrote—led the effort to have the United Nations change its odious resolution that equated Zionism with racism. Now, to get the United Nations to say that they ever did something wrong and to repeal it—similar to anything that even happens here, to say we did something wrong and to repeal some law—takes some negotiation. John Bolton was able to get the United Nations to repeal that odious resolution.

It is a clear, a very clear—example of his ability to stand by principle, stand for what is right, and also to work cooperatively with other countries in the United Nations.

So in my view, John Bolton has the knowledge and experience to effectively represent the United States at the United Nations and to negotiate the changes that need to be made to ensure its relevancy and its credibility in the future. All of us want a United Nations that is with us, working to advance free and just societies and human rights around the world. We do not want them squandering, wasting money, propping up repressive regimes, being a front for terrorist regimes. We need the United Nations to remember what its charter is.

Now, unfortunately, the committee was forced to spend a majority of its nomination hearing and subsequent meetings on tangents, exploring wild claims, and not addressing the issues that face the United States at the United Nations. Nor has the debate been much about John Bolton's qualifications to serve as our representative.

Most of those who have complained and made charges against John Bolton never had any intention of considering the merits of his nomination in the first place. When considered, as I said earlier, for his current position, all of these—Senators BIDEN, SARBANES, DODD, BOXER, and KERRY—voted against him. We have had many unsubstantiated claims and rumors and exaggerated innuendo. I do see the Senator from Wisconsin, who did vote for him the other time, so it does not apply to Senator FEINGOLD. I hope the Senator recognizes I did not list his name. I think, as people look at these overly hyped charges, they have been refuted. They do not have any bearing on John Bolton's ability to serve as our ambassador to the United Nations.

A President should have the prerogative to select the men and women—unless there is some extraordinary, proven infirmity or criminal violation—he determines to advance and lead his initiatives and also to keep the promises he made to the American people. President Bush has nominated John Bolton

to advance our foreign policy and goals at the United Nations.

Let me conclude with these final thoughts. In 1945, when it reported the U.N. Charter to the Senate for ratification, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wrote that:

... neither this Charter nor any other document or formula that might be devised can prevent war. . . . The establishment of the United Nations will at best be a beginning toward the creation of those conditions of stability throughout the world which will foster peace and security.

As we know, the United Nations has fallen short of these expectations. But a better, more accountable United Nations may better serve our interests much more reliably.

Thus, the Bolton nomination offers the Senate an opportunity to again play a historic role in bringing sensible reform to the United Nations. It is worth the effort. John Bolton is the right person to advocate our principles, and he will not be easily seduced by empty, meaningless, courteous pontifications of international bureaucracies.

John Bolton will bring much needed reform and accountability to the United Nations, that is in dire need of such to regain its credibility. He will be a watchdog, and that is what I think the taxpayers of this country want. He is going to be a strong diplomat, a man of vision, and an integral part of an administration team that has proven its readiness to foster positive change throughout the world.

The Senate, at 6 o'clock this evening, I hope, will take action—take action, and very positive action. There will be some differences, but let's recognize that this is a historic time, a time for change in the United Nations, a time for reform. And these reforms will be positive. Our taxpayers will support these changes.

I think freedom-loving countries and people who are not yet tasting that sweet nectar of liberty will also appreciate these changes. The billions of dollars going to the United Nations will be used for positive, constructive change in implementing and fostering the construction of those pillars that are so essential for a just and free society: The freedom of religion, freedom of expression, private ownership of property, and the rule of law. Those are the principles we need to address, and we are, as a country, in advancing the United Nations, consistent with its Charter, which ought to be a strong ally, not an impediment, in those efforts.

I hope we will work with John Bolton and the United Nations to bring forth this reform, improve the credibility and, in fact, the effectiveness of the United States and the United Nations, to advance freedom and justice for people throughout the world.

I thank you for your attention, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the confirmation of John

Bolton to be the next U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. I do not take this decision lightly. As the Senator from Virginia just pointed out, when Mr. Bolton's nomination was first announced, my vote was by no means a foregone conclusion. In fact, in 2001, when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee considered the nomination of Mr. Bolton to be the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, I parted company from my Democratic colleagues on the committee to vote in favor of his nomination both in committee and on the floor.

I did so because I generally believed, as the Senator from Virginia said, that the President has the right to choose executive branch nominees who share his overall world view, even when I do not share that world view. Barring serious ethical lapses or a clear lack of appropriate qualifications for a given job, I tend to give the President a great deal of latitude in making these appointments.

But after examining the record, I have concluded that Mr. Bolton is fundamentally unsuited for the job to which he has been nominated. His blatant hostility toward the institution at which he would serve and his history of pursuing his personal policy agenda while holding public office lead me to question whether Mr. Bolton's appointment as our ambassador to the United Nations would serve the interests of the United States.

I share the views of many who are insisting on reform at the U.N. The U.N. must become more effective and more accountable and, as stewards of the American taxpayers' dollars, we must insist on this point. But Mr. Bolton's record suggests that his personal animosity toward the United Nations is so great that he cannot effectively lead the charge for reforms that can make this vital, but deeply flawed, institution stronger and more effective.

He seems to view the U.N. as an instrument to be used when it suits only our immediate interests but one best ignored or even undermined the rest of the time. His failure to grasp the give and take required for effective multilateralism makes him a real obstacle to any hope of pursuing vital long-term U.S. interests and increasing burden sharing and marshaling a global force strong enough to defeat the terrorist networks that seek to do us harm.

Mr. Bolton's record also reveals many instances of intemperance and rash decisionmaking. At least two senior intelligence officials told committee staff that Bolton's draft testimony prepared for a House hearing on Syria in 2003 went well beyond what the intelligence community would clear or could clear. This wasn't a case in which State Department intelligence analysts alone had concerns about Bolton's proposed language. The CIA, the Department of Energy, and the Defense Intelligence Agency all ob-

jected. According to interviews conducted by the committee staff, Bolton's office pushed back, resisting the intelligence community's efforts to alter problematic provisions. Bolton was determined to be such a loose cannon that the Deputy Secretary of State instituted an extraordinary policy to address the problem, requiring all of Mr. Bolton's public presentations to be cleared by Larry Wilkerson, Secretary Powell's Chief of Staff, or Deputy Secretary Armitage himself.

Regrettably, I do not have confidence that his personal agenda would always, as it must be, subordinated to that of the Secretary of State who, in testimony before this committee in her first days in office, has placed such a premium on restoring frayed diplomatic ties.

In addition, information that came to light during the Senate Foreign Relation Committee's consideration of this nomination indicates that John Bolton has sought to punish intelligence analysts whose assessments did not support what Mr. Bolton wanted to say or wished to say. After all that has happened to our country's reputation and credibility in recent years, we cannot afford to tolerate, let alone promote, a policymaker who seeks to silence dissent from the intelligence community. What the committee found was not that Mr. Bolton made careless remarks in the heat of a tough bureaucratic dispute; the evidence shows that over a period of many months, Mr. Bolton repeatedly sought the removal of a respected intelligence analyst at the State Department who had raised concerns about language Mr. Bolton wished to use publicly, in the course of the standard clearance process, a process that is there to protect against misleading or inaccurate public characterizations of important security issues. And Mr. Bolton repeatedly sought the removal of the National Intelligence Officer for Latin America, again pursuing this vendetta for months, not heated minutes, and going so far as to consider blocking country clearance for Mr. Smith to travel abroad. In both cases, the offense that so incensed Mr. Bolton appears to be that the analysts did their jobs—they presented the facts as they saw them, and declined to keep silent when the facts did not support what Mr. Bolton wished to say. And in both cases, senior officials with decades of experience in government who were involved in these episodes told committee staff that Bolton's actions—his attempts to retaliate against these analysts—were absolutely extraordinary.

In addition to these disturbing incidents, other interviews conducted by committee staff revealed a broader pattern of attempting to simply cut those who disagreed with his policy views, or those who he believed disagreed with his policy views, out of the policy-making process entirely. John Wolf, the former Assistant Secretary of State for Non-Proliferation, told committee

staff that Bolton attempted to retaliate against at least two public servants in the non-proliferation bureau because of differences in their policy views. Mr. Bolton tried to remove a State Department attorney from a case relating to a sanctions issue because of perceived policy disagreements—the record suggests that Mr. Bolton actually misunderstood where the lawyer in question stood—and went so far as to suggest that he would not work with the State Department's entire legal bureau on the matter from that point on—a declaration quickly negated by Deputy Secretary Armitage, who felt compelled to remind Bolton that as a State Department official, he would indeed be working with the State Department's lawyers. This kind of tunnel-vision, everyone-else-out-of-the-room approach was summed up by Secretary of State Powell's Chief of Staff Larry Wilkerson, who told the committee staff, "when people ignore diplomacy that is aimed at dealing with [North Korea's nuclear weapons development] in order to push their pet rocks in other areas, it bothers me, as a diplomat, and as a citizen of this country." When asked specifically if he thought that Mr. Bolton had done that, Wilkerson said, "Absolutely." Mr. Wilkerson ended his interview with the committee with the following:

I would like to make just one statement. I don't have a large problem with Under Secretary Bolton serving our country. My objections to what we've been talking about here—that is, him being our ambassador at the United Nations—stem from two basic things. One, I think he's a lousy leader. And there are 100 to 150 people up there that have to be led; they have to be led well, and they have to be led properly. And I think, in that capacity, if he goes up there, you'll see the proof of the pudding in a year. Second, I differ from a lot of people in Washington, both friend and foe of Under Secretary Bolton, as to his, "brilliance". I didn't see it. I saw a man who counted beans, who said, "98 today, 99 tomorrow, 100 the next day," and had no willingness—and, in many cases, no capacity—to understand the other things that were happening around those beans. And that is just a recipe for problems at the United Nations. And that's the only reason that I said anything.

Some have suggested that, because Mr. Bolton did not succeed in his attempts to end the careers of analysts whose dissenting views angered him, and because he did not succeed in his attempts to manipulate the government's processes to shut out voices of disagreement, caution, or dissent, there is no problem here. I cannot believe that any of my colleagues actually believes that is true—not after all that we have learned about the vital importance of dissent in the intelligence community from the 9/11 Commission, the Silberman-Robb Commission, and numerous other investigations into the major intelligence failures that have gravely harmed our credibility and our security over the past years. Why would we choose to promote to a position of prominence and trust an individual who has repeatedly tried to suppress inconvenient

analysis? As the former Chairman of the National Intelligence Council told the committee staff, politicization “even when it’s successfully resisted, it doesn’t mean that there hasn’t been an effect, because it creates a climate of intimidation and a culture of conformity that is damaging.” Carl Ford told this committee about his concerns of a “chilling effect” that Bolton’s actions with regard to Mr. Westermann could have on all of the analysts in the department’s intelligence analysis bureau. And Mr. Westermann told the committee staff that in the wake of his run in with Mr. Bolton, “I was concerned that I had to spend time thinking about how I was approaching issues so that I didn’t step on a landmine.” Attempting to undermine important clearance processes, attempting to run roughshod over the safeguards in place to protect U.S. credibility, is an awfully big problem, whether or not the attempt was successful. It is, in my view, a disqualifying problem.

Finally, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to examine the record of the Foreign Relations Committee’s consideration of this nomination. It raises very serious concerns regarding Mr. Bolton’s understanding of his obligations to be forthcoming with this committee. Several of Mr. Bolton’s answers to Senators’ questions were misleading at best, and several were quite blatantly non-responsive. A number of these instances relate to Mr. Bolton’s efforts to retaliate against intelligence analysts, and these are detailed in the minority report on this nominee. But others relate to more general foreign policy issues. The Bush administration’s first Ambassador to South Korea, Tom Hubbard, was so troubled by Mr. Bolton’s misleading characterization of Mr. Hubbard’s role in approving a controversial speech that Mr. Bolton gave in Seoul that he felt obligated to contact the committee to correct the record.

In light of the evidence this committee has seen in recent weeks, most of us can probably agree that if Mr. Bolton does end up being our next Ambassador to the UN, extremely careful oversight will be required. But our oversight responsibilities depend, in many instances, on the executive branch officials who come before us understanding that they have a constitutional obligation to be forthcoming with Congress. The record that he has amassed during this confirmation process gives me no confidence that Mr. Bolton intends to adhere to this obligation.

Mr. Bolton’s nomination raises fundamental questions regarding both credibility and accountability. The credibility of our representation at the UN, the credibility of intelligence, the credibility of the oversight process are at stake. And the question of whether or not this committee will hold officials who seek to suppress dissent accountable for their actions is before us today as well.

I deeply appreciate the extraordinary courage of the many people who came forward to share with the Foreign Relations Committee their own concerns about Mr. Bolton’s fitness for the UN post or to correct inaccuracies in the record—in some cases at real risk to their own careers. I am grateful for their efforts, and deeply appreciate their honesty. I hope that my colleagues will consider their words carefully. Their statements came at a price to them, and they should not be ignored.

In contrast to these admirable public servants—many of whom, by the way, I would likely disagree with on any number of important policy issues—the administration has failed to be forthcoming in this process. Mr. President, I share the concerns that have been expressed by some of my colleagues on the Committee regarding the administration’s failure to respond satisfactorily to requests for documents and information relating to this confirmation. The administration declined to produce requested documents and information, apparently because they do not believe the requested information is relevant. Quite frankly, that is not for the administration to determine. Not only does the administration’s rationale fail to respect the Congress as a co-equal branch of Government, it also speaks of bad faith and contempt for the role of Congress in the confirmation process.

Finally, Mr. President, during the committee’s consideration of this nomination, Senator SARBANES reminded all of us of the history of the position of the United States Ambassador to the United Nations. He listed the names of all 24 public servants who have held the office. Twenty-two of those twenty four were confirmed by unanimous consent, or with unanimous votes, or with voice votes. One was confirmed by a vote of 89 to 3. The most controversial Ambassador in our history was confirmed by a vote of 81–16. We have been represented by some very direct, opinionated, colorful characters at the United Nations. But we have never sent a figure so polarizing, or one with credibility so tattered, as the nominee before us today. John Bolton does not have the support of a single Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He does not have the support of a majority of that committee. I do not understand why the administration is insisting upon thrusting such a troubled nominee into such a sensitive and important post. From achieving real reform of the UN to rebuilding US credibility to creating a solid global coalition to combat terrorism, the stakes at the UN are as high as they have ever been. If the President had chosen a public servant of impeccable judgment, the committee and the Senate would have rallied around that selection, eager to work in partnership with a nominee capable of, and committed to, mending frayed relationships, encouraging real burden-sharing,

and nurturing a strong international coalition to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. John Bolton is not that nominee. I urge my colleagues to reject this nomination, and let us work together to quickly confirm a different nominee—one who represents the President’s views but also has the skills, the record, and the confidence of the Senate required to be an effective ambassador. We can do, and we should do, much better than John Bolton.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about the nomination of John Bolton. The Presiding Officer is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and we spent a good deal of time listening to testimony on the President’s nomination of Mr. Bolton to be Permanent Representative at the United Nations.

On the face of it, he is as well qualified for this position as any person who has ever been nominated for the position. He has a distinguished background, confirmed by this body, I believe, four times, 4 years ago as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security. He was Assistant Secretary for International Organizations under the first President Bush, for whom I served. He was assistant to Attorney General of the Department of Justice in the late 1980s. That would be during the Reagan administration. That is a big job. I believe he was the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. He was Assistant Administrator for Program Policy Coordination for USAID in 1982 and 1983. He was general counsel for the U.S. Agency for International Development.

He has the kind of academic record all of us would like to have: summa cum laude from Yale, a JDL from Yale Law School.

He comes from an enormously distinguished background. As has often been pointed out on this floor and in committee hearings, he has some solid accomplishments, including leading the American efforts to repeal the resolution at the United Nations which equated Zionism with racism and his work with the liberation of Kuwait in 1991 through the U.N. Security Council. When former U.S. Secretary of State Jim Baker was asked to help the United Nations in its work in western Sahara, Secretary Baker, who is known for choosing exceptionally talented people to work with him, asked John

Bolton to work with him in the western Sahara in the 1990s pro bono. He designed the current administration's proliferation security initiative under which more than 60 nations now share intelligence and take action to stop the transfer of dangerous weapons.

So I was not one bit surprised when Mr. Bolton made an impressive appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee on the first day of our testimony. He demonstrated command of the issues facing the United Nations. He got a lot of intense questioning, as he should from Senators, for such an important position. The questioning lasted for more than 7 hours. He was calm and collected. He answered the questions with great skill and accuracy, I thought, and he focused on the need for reform of the United Nations.

He brought with him for that testimony strong support of former Secretaries of State Jim Baker, Larry Eagleberger, Al Hague, Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, and endorsements from more than 50 former ambassadors. I was with one of those ambassadors a few weeks ago, a man very well known in this body, a former Senator and majority leader, Howard Baker. Howard Baker has just returned from 4 years as Ambassador to Japan. He did a tremendous job there, as everyone expected him to, but he remarked to me privately and said I was free to say it publicly—in fact, he volunteered the information—about how he had dealt with Secretary Bolton during those 4 years in Tokyo, these last 4 years, from time to time, and how impressed he was with him and how much he enjoyed working with him. He liked him. He said he spoke frankly, and Senator Baker said he thought John Bolton would make a good ambassador to the United Nations.

The second day of hearings that the Presiding Officer and I were privileged to be a part of was a little different. I was, frankly, disappointed by what I heard. One of the witnesses was called forward, the former Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Research, and he presented evidence about how John Bolton had, in his words, chewed out intelligence analysts in the State Department.

Mr. Ford was mad about that. He didn't like the fact that Mr. Bolton had chewed out people on down the line and he came to us and told us so. He was a convincing witness. He was believable because he didn't overstate his case and the information he gave us was information I would rather not have known about the next ambassador to the United Nations. I am sure Mr. Bolton was disappointed, perhaps even embarrassed to hear it.

But Mr. Ford did not say, in the case that we were talking about, that Mr. Bolton was misusing or compromising intelligence. In fact, Mr. Ford himself said, "In this particular case"—the one Mr. Ford was led to complain about, "there wasn't politicization of the in-

telligence." Mr. Ford was very clear on that point in his testimony to the committee.

In other interviews conducted by our Foreign Relations Committee staff since that time, another issue was raised about a disagreement about intelligence. One of Mr. Bolton's subordinates who was on detail from the CIA sent a report to the Deputy Secretary of State for review and was unhappy that another bureau had put a memo on top of that report that said the report was incorrect. That certainly sounds like a lot of inside baseball to people outside of Washington, and it sounds like a simple disagreement to me, a disagreement over intelligence that is quite common, from what even Mr. Ford said. In this case, there is no evidence Mr. Bolton was even aware of the dispute. So, again, no evidence of politicization of intelligence. Rather, it appeared that different staff members were arguing for their own point of view, which should not surprise anyone around here.

There have been a variety of other charges and suggestions. Mr. Bolton has had the pleasure that many Presidential nominees had. I was once a Presidential nominee and went through a confirmation process when the Senate was in the hands of the Democrats. So they made sure that everything about me was pretty well known and explained. They took time to do it. I was as polite and happy as I could be. No one enjoys all of that, but it serves its purpose, and it served its purpose with Mr. Bolton as well.

In the end, it is my judgment, after attending the hearings, reading the testimony, conferring with others who have known Mr. Bolton over time, that only one charge against John Bolton appears to have any substance. John Bolton has been rude to staff members who are below him in the bureaucracy. As I said, I imagine he is embarrassed by that. I didn't like to hear it. Perhaps he deserves to be embarrassed by those charges and perhaps he has even learned a lesson. But what I heard hasn't changed my vote, even though it might change Mr. Bolton's ways of dealing with people with whom he works.

How significant is such a charge, that he was rude to people in the bureaucracy? As has been mentioned by many others in this body, if that were the standard for remaining in the Senate we would all have a hard time getting a quorum. There are regularly occasions when busy Senators eager to make their own point are brusque—with staff members, even shout at colleagues. In fact, the shouting was so loud in one business meeting of our Foreign Relations Committee by some of the Senators I could barely hear the charges against Mr. Bolton.

That is not attractive. I do not endorse it. It has even caused me to think back about times that I may have become angry or brusque or impatient or startled in dealing with a staff member

or another person, and I have always regretted it when I have and it has made me redouble my efforts to make sure I swallow my pride more quickly and think about what I say and not do that anymore. It is not good conduct. It is not good business. But just how significant is this?

Here is what former Secretary of State Larry Eagleberger had to say about it a couple of weeks ago in the Washington Post. This deserves special attention.

Larry Eagleberger was Secretary of State for the first President Bush. But, in a way, he was more than that. Larry Eagleberger had 27 years in the Foreign Service. We hear a lot of times that a football player is a football player's player, or a man is a man's man, or a woman is a woman's woman. Larry Eagleberger is a Foreign Service Officer's Secretary of State. He had and has enormous respect from those men and women who put their lives on the line daily around the world and in the United States in support of our diplomacy, our foreign policy, and our country.

Here is what Larry Eagleberger had to say about John Bolton in an op-ed in the Washington Post:

"As to the charge that Bolton has been tough on superordinates," Secretary Eagleberger said, "I can say that only in more than a decade of association with him in the State Department I never saw or heard anything to support such a charge, nor do I see anything wrong with challenging intelligence analysts on their findings. They can, as recent history demonstrates, make mistakes. And they must be prepared to defend their findings under intense questioning. If John pushed too hard or dressed down subordinates, he deserves criticism but it hardly merits a vote against confirmation when balanced against his many accomplishments."

That is Larry Eagleberger, the Foreign Service officer's Secretary of State.

Where Larry Eagleberger comes down is where I come down. I believe the benefit of hearing Mr. Ford's testimony may prove to be a little bit of a lesson to Mr. Bolton, and a reminder to the rest of us, us Senators, of how unattractive it is to shout at an associate or unnecessarily dress down a staff member.

I agree with Secretary Eagleberger. John Bolton has a distinguished background and record. He has dedicated himself to improving our country's foreign policy. His action toward subordinates might have been inappropriate. Perhaps he has learned a lesson. But it doesn't cause me to change my vote. I am glad to support him.

This is a critical time for the United Nations. Even the Secretary General acknowledges it is in need of reform. Billions of dollars filtered from the U.N. coffers to Saddam Hussein's pockets in the oil-for-food scandal. Top human rights abusers such as Sudan and Zimbabwe sit on the Human Rights Commission. United Nations peacekeepers in Africa have been found to rape and pillage.

The United Nations has many important roles in the world. I am glad we have them. I want it to work. The President is right in his thinking that we need to take action to help the United Nations reform itself and that a frank-talking, experienced diplomat named John Bolton is an excellent candidate for that commission.

I am pleased to support this nomination. I hope my colleagues will do the same.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

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

NATURAL GAS PRICES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I take a few minutes to speak about natural gas prices, the prices at the pump, blue-collar workers, farmers, and homeowners.

The reason I do that is because the Senate Energy Committee earlier today did a good piece of work that I hope the American people understand.

By a virtually unanimous vote, 21 to 1, the committee, after 5 months of work, reported to this body what I hope will be called the Clean Energy Act of 2005.

I suppose people outside of the Senate get tired of hearing Senators compliment one another, but I do that today because this would not have happened had it not been for the leadership of Chairman PETE DOMENICI, the Republican chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and the ranking Democrat, JEFF BINGAMAN.

We tried to do this in the last session of Congress in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. We were not able to pass an energy bill to give this country a comprehensive energy policy. Senator DOMENICI deliberately set out to do things different in this session of Congress. He sat down with Senator BINGAMAN and the Democratic staff and pledged to work with them, to share everything with them. Senator DOMENICI visited every member of the committee, Republican and Democrat. We worked together on a variety of major hearings and roundtables. The coal roundtable lasted 3 or 4 hours; one on natural gas lasted 3 or 4 hours. He encouraged a variety of committee members to become involved.

On the Subcommittee on Energy, which I chair, he encouraged me to go ahead and, working with Senator TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota from across the aisle, we came up with a Natural Gas Price Reduction Act of 2005 into which we put ideas to bring down the \$7 natural gas price we have today, which is the highest natural gas price in the world. Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN did their best to come up with aggressive ideas.

Sometimes when Members set out to compromise and work together, we end up with nothing because the easiest way to compromise is to do nothing. We can all agree on doing nothing and

then we will not have a bold bill. But we are almost fortunate this did not pass last year because this is a more urgent time. The natural gas prices are \$7, the highest in the industrial world. We have gone from the lowest in the industrial world to the highest in the industrial world. Prices at the pump are high. We have a million blue-collar manufacturing jobs in the chemical industry alone that will go overseas if we do not find some way to deal with this.

September 11 was a big surprise to our country. Our next big surprise is going to be to our pocketbooks if we do not figure out how to deal with the price of energy. We must figure out how to have a low-cost, adequate, reliable supply of clean energy that is increasingly produced in the United States of America and not overseas. That is our goal.

What is exceptional about this bill, in my view, is that it attacks the problem in a much more comprehensive way than other versions of the bill have. It begins with aggressive conservation. For example, the appliance efficiency standards, which are in this year's bill, are about double the effectiveness of those that were in last year's bill. What does that mean? It simply means that by some estimates these standards could save at peak demand the equivalent of 45 500-megawatt powerplants. If we save building 45 gas powerplants, we decrease the building of natural gas and we tend to lower the price.

There are a good many other examples of aggressive conservation. The second thing the bill does is to begin to change the way we produce electricity. This country produces about 25 percent of all the energy in the world. We use it here. We have 5 to 6 percent of the American people and we produce 25 percent of the energy. Where does that electricity come from? It comes primarily from what we call nonrenewables. It comes from, first, coal; natural gas, second; and nuclear, third. That is 91 percent of it. Now, another 7 percent comes from dams from hydropower and about 2 percent comes from renewable power, which is windmills, solar, biomass, and geothermal.

If we are in competition with China and India for jobs, and an important part of every farm, every manufacturing plant, every home, is the provision of reliable, low-cost, adequate supply of energy, as a practical matter for the next 20 years, most of that will have to come from nuclear power, from coal, and from gas and conservation. That is where it has to come.

Of course, we want to do more with other kinds of energy. For example, I hope the tax committee, when it reports its part of this bill, does something about solar power. We have a renewable tax credit in the law today that does not do much for solar. It encourages powerplants that produce electricity from sun. We almost don't have any of those. What we use solar for is, we put shingles on roofs. We

need to give incentives to individual owners to do more of that. That's why I proposed an investment tax credit so individual owners can take advantage of it.

We can do more research and development in biomass and more research and development in geothermal. Even if we do all that we can do for the so-called renewable energies, in the next 20 years—and there is some disagreement about this—in my view, we will still be producing about 95 percent of our power—certainly not less than 90 percent of our power—from nuclear power, from coal, from gas, and hydro.

Now, how many more dams are going to be built in the United States? It is limited. In fact, this bill addresses relicensing of hydro dams. There are a good number of those in Oregon where the Presiding Officer comes from. By the year 2018, according to the National Hydropower Association, there will be 30,000 MW of hydropower plants that need to be relicensed. That's half of the hydropower in the United States. This landmark, bipartisan agreement on hydro relicensing is both urgent and meaningful.

So if one puts all of that aside, if we want to compete for our jobs with people from around the world and if the price of energy is a big part of it, what do we have to do? Nuclear, coal and gas.

Over the last 10 years, almost all of the new powerplants in America that make electricity have been built from natural gas. Now, how wise is that? Here we are with \$7 a unit natural gas, the highest price in the industrialized world, our chemical companies, our blue-collar companies using this, some of them as a raw material—Dow Chemical estimates that 40 percent of the cost of its production is energy. Now, if in other parts of the world natural gas is significantly lower, we will have a problem. We will have jobs moving from here to there.

We do not want to make all of our power from natural gas. We do it because we know how to do it and because it is clean. That leaves us with two sources of what we call base load energy, the two things that we must find a way to use and use in a clean way if we want to have a low-cost supply of American-produced energy. One of those is nuclear, and one of those is coal.

Nuclear power is a technology that we invented in the United States, the peaceful uses of the atom. We figured out how to do that in the 1950s. One of the remarkable technological stories in the United States is our Navy and its nuclear-powered vessels. I suppose it is a classified matter exactly how many we have, but we have dozens of them. Some of them have small reactors. Some of them have a couple of big reactors on them.

Since the 1950s, there has never been one single nuclear reactor accident in the U.S. Navy, not one. They are underwater. When they are above water,

they dock at ports all around the United States, and we use them. In our country today, 20 percent of all of our electricity and 70 percent of our carbon-free electricity is produced by nuclear energy. Yet we have not built a nuclear powerplant in the United States since the 1970s, not one new one. How wise is that?

Other countries in the world are. Eighty percent of France's electricity is now produced by nuclear power. Japan, ravaged by nuclear weapons in World War II, relies on nuclear power. They build one or two new plants a year.

We are in competition to keep jobs here. We want clean power. We increasingly want carbon-free power. If 70 percent of our carbon-free electricity is nuclear, then what is keeping us from going ahead? This bill will help us move ahead because it makes it easier for investors to build nuclear powerplants that are safe.

Senator DOMENICI has come up with an imaginative loan guarantee program that would help launch an entire new generation of nuclear powerplants. Senator CRAIG, Senator DOMENICI, and Senator BINGAMAN have come up with a program that will be based in Idaho for advanced research on how we build lower cost, more effective nuclear powerplants for our country. There is a growing consensus, especially as the Kyoto Treaty and the need to be concerned about global warming persuades more and more people of the importance of capturing carbon, that nuclear power for the next 15 or 20 years is the only logical first step to having a low-cost, adequate, reliable supply of American-produced clean energy. Britain recently has been coming to the same conclusion that nuclear is a necessity for a carbon-free emissions future.

What is the other step? The other step is coal. We instinctively think coal is dirty and it is a source of a lot of problems because of the pollution it causes.

I live 2 miles away from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. It is the most polluted national park in America. The Knoxville area where I live is one of the most polluted parts of our country. Why is that? There is too much sulphur, too much nitrogen, and too much mercury in the air. Much of that comes from coal-fired powerplants, not just from the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has a number of them in the area, but from all over America. The wind blows the air in, and it backs up against the Great Smoky Mountains, which are the highest mountains in the East, and we breathe the dirty air. So any energy bill has to be a clean energy bill so we can solve our air pollution problems.

There is an even larger issue with coal-fired powerplants. India and China, with their huge economies, a couple of billion more people, are going to be building hundreds of powerplants in the next few years. The conventional

coal plant is what many of those plants will be. If India, China, Malaysia, Brazil, and the rest of the world build only conventional coal plants, it will not matter very much what our clean air policies are in the United States because they will produce so many pollutants around the world that when the wind blows them around the world and over the air in the United States, we will suffer from that. So if we solve the problem of how to burn coal in a clean way, then the rest of the world is likely to pick up our innovation and solve their problem because they do not want to have polluted air, either.

So how do we do that? Well, there seems to be a way to do it. We call it coal gasification. There are several technologies. I like to call it clean coal gas because that makes it a little easier to talk about.

The New York Times business section had an excellent article on this on Sunday that Senator DOMENICI gave to all of us. It talked about this idea of taking coal, turning it into gas, and then burning the gas. That solves a great amount of the pollution. It solves the sulphur, the nitrogen, and the mercury part of the pollution, but it does not solve the carbon part.

Then what we need to try to do is to advance the technology of capturing and sequestering the carbon—in other words, getting rid of the carbon. If we are ever able to do that, we could burn coal as cleanly as we can burn gas, capture the carbon and put it in the ground, and we would never have to worry about the Kyoto Treaty. We would never have to worry about the McCain-Lieberman bill or the Carper-Chafee-Gregg-Alexander bill or caps on carbon because we would not be producing carbon. We would be producing it and recapturing it. Nuclear power is free of it, and clean coal gasification with carbon sequestration captures it and gets rid of it.

The other thing is that we are the Saudi Arabia of coal. We have a 500-year supply of it. So if we can move ahead with nuclear and clean coal gas, we can lower the price of natural gas, and we can have more American-produced energy.

So this legislation begins with aggressive conservation. As I said, the appliance efficiency standards alone would save the building of forty-five 500-megawatt gas plants, but then it begins to change the way we make electricity by research and development in advanced nuclear technology, by the loan guarantee support which could be for nuclear plants of that kind. It also has loan guarantees that I hope would help launch a half dozen coal gasification powerplants and a half dozen coal gasification plants at industrial sites. It also has research and development support for carbon sequestration and for other technologies that hold promise.

We still have some issues to work on. We began with what we could agree on, worked 5 months on it under the lead-

ership of Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN, and reserved a few issues to the floor. Senator DOMENICI announced that we will be coming to the Senate floor shortly after the recess, in a completely different spirit than last year, with all of us hoping to get a result. We will then put that bill with the House bill and present to this country a clean energy act of 2005 that will lower natural gas prices, begin to produce more American energy at home, include more aggressive conservation, change the way we make electricity, and focus especially on advanced technologies for nuclear, coal gasification, and the supply of gas.

In the short term, we are going to have to bring more gas in from around the world in liquefied natural gas. I'm pleased that the committee adopted the ideas I and Senator JOHNSON had on LNG siting in the energy bill.

There is one other area I want to mention without dwelling on it too much. One of the things I hope happens as we debate this bill is that it doesn't change from a national energy policy into a national windmill policy. I say that because one of the issues we have pushed out to be debated on the floor is something called a renewable portfolio standard, renewable energy. That all sounds very good. The proposal was, let's make 10 percent of all of our electricity by the year 2025 from renewable energies. That sounds good, too.

The problem is, I don't think it will work because all we are talking about is geothermal—that is hot water from the ground—solar, which our incentives today don't help much, and biomass, which is burning wood chips and other such technologies. According to a Department of Energy analysis, even if we had such a requirement of all our electric companies that they produce 10 percent of their energy from renewable fuels, they couldn't do it. They could only get to 5 percent due to the way the Bingaman price caps are structured. So what utilities would do realistically is buy credits in a complicated scheme which would then raise the price of our electricity. We should be in the business of lowering energy prices, not raising them for nothing.

The other concern I have is that a renewable portfolio standard is really a wind standard because geothermal and solar and biomass will only increase it a tiny bit. This information I have is from an analysis that the Energy Information Agency did on Bingaman's bill shows clearly that the impact of a Bingaman RPS is growing windpower. The only way to go forward is with windmills. So the effect of continuing the current policy is to take this country from about 6,700 windmills to 40, 60, 80,000, depending on estimates that you believe. My point is not to make a big discussion about the windmills themselves. I don't like to see them. I think most people don't. The Governor of Kansas has put a moratorium on some windmills, as has the Governor of New Jersey, and so have communities in

many parts of America, such as Vermont and Wisconsin. I asked the Tennessee Valley Authority to put a 2-year moratorium on new wind power on Tennessee until we could assess the damage it might cause to our tourism industry and to our electric rates and to our view of the mountains.

People think of windmills and think those are nice. Grandma had one on her farm. It was by the well. My grandparents did. But these aren't your grandmother's windmills.

We have the second largest football stadium in the United States in Knoxville, TN. We call it Neyland Stadium. One hundred seven thousand people can sit there, and it has sky boxes that go up as high as you can see. Just one of these windmills would fit into Neyland Stadium. The rotor blades would extend from the 10-yard line to the 10-yard line. The top of the windmill would go twice as high as the sky boxes or more. And on a clear night you could see the red lights 25 miles away. There are significant problems with this power. It only works 25 to 40 percent of the time. You don't get rid of any nuclear or coal plants when you have the windmills because you still need the power. You can't store the energy for your lights or your computer and all the things you use electricity for going all the time. So there are many problems.

But here is the biggest problem, the one I want to mention today. I will just leave it for the members of the Finance Committee upon which the Presiding Officer serves and others. This Energy bill will have three parts to it. It will have some things from the Energy Committee which we have finished today. It will have a contribution from the Finance Committee, which will come in June, and it will have a contribution from the Environment and Public Works Committee, which will also come in June. We will put all those parts together.

We are told that this whole bill, when it is put together, can't cost, our Budget Committee says, more than \$11 billion. The President hopes we won't spend more than \$8 billion. But the production tax credit in the current policy provides \$3.9 billion over 5 years, almost all of which will go to windmills unless we change the policy.

In other words, if we have \$11 billion to spend and we spend \$3 billion on ethanol or renewable fuel, we will only have \$8 billion left to spend on everything else, and nearly 3.5 to 4 of it will go for windmills. That is what I mean by a national windmill policy.

My hope is that my colleagues will take a fresh look at our tax credit for renewable fuels and make sure that we use it wisely because that is a lot of money to create the largest amount of carbon-free clean energy.

Here are some of the suggestions for better use: For example, \$1.5 billion for consumer incentives for 300,000 hybrid and advanced diesel vehicles. That would give 300,000 Americans a \$2,000

deduction to purchase a hybrid car or an advanced diesel vehicle. Those operate about 40 percent more efficiently than conventional cars. That saves a lot of energy. For \$750 million, we could give manufacturing incentives for building those hybrid cars and advanced vehicles in the United States. Unfortunately, as it stands now, we aren't doing that. They would all be built overseas because most of the good hybrid technology has been invented overseas and is being rented to the United States. That would be 39,000 jobs in the United States.

I have with me a copy of the National Commission on Energy Policy which recommends both of these ideas, the \$2,000 tax deduction and the incentive for manufacturing of hybrid cars. That would be a wise way to spend money for clean carbon-free energy.

There are many more good ideas: \$2 billion in tax incentives for energy-efficient appliances and buildings, suggested by Senators SNOWE and FEINSTEIN. Senator JOHNSON and I had suggested \$2 billion for tax incentives to commercialize coal gasification for powerplants and \$300 million to make more effective support of another renewable energy, solar energy, which has basically no support the way our laws are written today.

The National Commission on Energy Policy has several other recommendations: Build in tax incentives to commercialize carbon capture and geologic sequestration in a wide array of industries. As soon as we figure out how to capture carbon, we can use coal gasification in a big way to reduce dependence on foreign energy and to lower the cost of natural gas.

They also recommend \$2 billion in tax incentives for nuclear deployment, \$1.5 billion for biodiesel and nonpetroleum low-carbon fuels. I have suggested those in the order in which I like them.

I am not a member of the Finance Committee so I won't have a chance to be a part of that discussion in that committee. My point is simply that if we have \$8 billion to spend or \$11 billion to spend, we may have already spent a couple of billion in what we are doing with renewable fuel, then we have a lot more good ways to spend money in support of carbon-free energy than we have money for. I respectfully suggest that if we are spending most of \$3.7 billion over the next 5 years as a national windmill policy and not a national energy policy, that ought to be reasonably adjusted.

Let me not emphasize the disputes that we have yet to come. I am here today to say, particularly, after a time in the Senate when people who watch us must wonder if we are speaking to each other, the answer is, yes, we are. We have been meeting for 5 months on this Energy bill. We have been working together, as Senator BINGAMAN said today. I don't remember a party-line vote in the 5 months. We had some close votes, but it wasn't Republican versus Democrat. It was just different

ones of us with different opinions. And there must have been half the committee there today when Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN announced the results at a press conference.

So I honor them for their leadership. I think the American people are proud of DOMENICI and BINGAMAN as Senators. New Mexico ought to be proud. It has both of them from the same State. Even though we have CAFE standards still to debate, MTBE still to debate, we have some final work to do on how do we site terminals for liquefied natural gas, further increasing the supply of natural gas, and we will be debating the so-called renewable portfolio standard for how many windmills we should have—all that will be sometime in June. That is what we are supposed to do as Senators.

That is why we are here, to take both sides of this issue and see if we can come to a good result. So far, I think we have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my speech the article on coal gasification from the New York Times business section on Sunday; a letter I wrote to the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, asking them to put a 2-year moratorium on wind power until we had an opportunity—we in Congress and local officials—to consider the effect of these large wind farms on our tourism industry, on our view of the mountains, on our gas prices; and finally, an article from the Guardian Unlimited, which is an interesting discussion of what is going on in Great Britain, as they consider how to meet the Kyoto standard for carbon-free electricity production, and how many of the people who formerly had favored large windmills are concluding they don't want them destroying the rural areas of Britain, and they are looking at nuclear power in a fresh way which, as I mentioned, is the way we in the United States today produce 70 percent of our carbon-free electricity.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 22, 2005]
DIRTY SECRET: COAL PLANTS COULD BE MUCH CLEANER

(By Kenneth J. Stier)

Almost a decade ago, Tampa Electric opened an innovative power plant that turned coal, the most abundant but the dirtiest fossil fuel, into a relatively clean gas, which it burns to generate electricity. Not only did the plant emit significantly less pollution than a conventional coal-fired power plant, but it was also 10 percent more efficient.

Hazel R. O'Leary, the secretary of energy at the time, went to the plant, situated between Tampa and Orlando, and praised it for ushering in a "new era for clean energy from coal." Federal officials still refer to the plant's "integrated gasification combined cycle" process as a "core technology" for the future, especially because of its ability—eventually—to all but eliminate the greenhouse gases linked to global warming.

Since that plant opened, however, not a single similar plant has been built in the

United States. Abundant supplies of natural gas—a bit cleaner and, until recently, a lot cheaper—stood in the way.

But even now, with gas prices following oil prices into the stratosphere and power companies turning back to coal, most new plants—about nine out of 10 on the drawing board—will not use integrated gasification combined-cycle technology.

The reason is fairly simple. A plant with the low-pollution, high-efficiency technology demonstrated at the Tampa Electric plant is about 20 percent more expensive to build than a conventional plant that burns pulverized coal. This complicates financing, especially in deregulated markets, while elsewhere utilities must persuade regulators to set aside their customary standard of requiring utilities to use their lowest-cost alternatives. (A federal grant of \$143 million covered about a fourth of the construction cost of the Tampa Electric plant, which was originally a demonstration project.)

The technology's main long-term advantage—the ability to control greenhouse gas emissions—is not winning over many utilities because the country does not yet regulate those gases.

That could be a problem for future national policy, critics say, because the plants being planned today will have a lifetime of a half-century or more. "It's a very frightening specter that we are going to essentially lock down our carbon emissions for the next 50 years before we have another chance to think about it again," said Jason S. Grumet, the executive director of the National Commission on Energy Policy.

The commission, an independent, bipartisan advisory body, has recommended that the federal government spend an additional \$4 billion over 10 years to speed the power industry's acceptance of the technology. In a recent report, the commission concluded that "the future of coal and the success of greenhouse gas mitigation policies may well hinge to a large extent on whether this technology can be successfully commercialized and deployed over the next 20 years."

Mr. Grumet was more succinct. Integrated gasification combined cycle technology, combined with the sequestration of carbon stripped out in the process, "is as close to a silver bullet as you're ever going to see," he said.

Until Congress regulates carbon emissions—a move that many in the industry consider inevitable, but unlikely soon—gasification technology will catch on only as its costs gradually come down. Edward Lowe, general manager of gasification for GE Energy, a division of General Electric that works with Bechtel to build integrated gasification combined-cycle plants, said that would happen as more plants were built. The premium should disappear entirely after the first dozen or so are completed, he added.

Even now, Mr. Lowe said, the technology offers operational cost savings that offset some of the higher construction costs. And if Congress eventually does limit carbon emissions, as many utility executives say they expect it to do, the technology's operational advantages could make it a bargain.

James E. Rogers, the chief executive of Cinergy, a heavily coal-dependent Midwestern utility, is one of the technology's biggest industry supporters. "I'm making a bet on gasification," he said, because he assumes a carbon-constrained world is inevitable. "I don't see any other way forward," he said.

The operating savings of such plants start with more efficient combustion: they make use of at least 15 percent more of the energy released by burning coal than conventional plants do, so less fuel is needed. The plants also need about 40 percent less water than

conventional coal plants, a significant consideration in arid Western states.

But for some people, including Mr. Rogers and other utility leaders who anticipate stricter pollution limits, the primary virtue of integrated gasification combined-cycle plants is their ability to chemically strip pollutants from gasified coal more efficiently and cost-effectively, before it is burned, rather than trying to filter it out of exhaust.

Proponents say that half of coal's pollutants—including sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides, which contribute to acid rain and smog—can be chemically stripped out before combustion. So can about 95 percent of the mercury in coal, at about a tenth the cost of trying to scrub it from exhaust gases racing up a smokestack.

The biggest long-term draw for gasification technology is its ability to capture carbon before combustion. If greenhouse-gas limits are enacted, that job will be much harder and more expensive to do with conventional coal-fired plants. Mr. Lowe, the G.E. executive, estimated that capturing carbon would add about 25 percent to the cost of electricity from a combined-cycle plant burning gasified coal, but that it would add 70 percent to the price of power from conventional plants.

Gasification technology, although new to the power sector, has been widely used in the chemical industry for decades, and the general manager of the gasification plant run by Tampa Electric, Mark Hornick, said it was not difficult to train his employees to run the plant. Tampa Electric is the principal subsidiary of TECO Energy of Tampa.

Disposing of the carbon dioxide gas stripped out in the process, however, is another matter. Government laboratories have experimented with dissolving the gas in saline aquifers or pumping it into geologic formations under the sea. The petroleum industry has long injected carbon dioxide into oil fields to help push more crude to the surface.

Refining and commercializing these techniques is a significant part of a \$35 billion package of clean energy incentives that the National Commission on Energy Policy is recommending. The Senate considered some of those ideas in a big energy policy bill last week, but it is doubtful whether Congress will approve the funds to enact them because they are tied to regulating big carbon emissions for the first time, something that many industry leaders and sympathetic lawmakers oppose.

Still, the energy bill may have some incentives for industry to adopt gasification technology, and the Department of Energy will continue related efforts. These include FutureGen, a \$950 million project to demonstrate gasification's full potential—not just for power plants but as a source of low-carbon liquid fuels for cars and trucks as well, and, further out, as a source of hydrogen fuel.

Regardless of the politics of carbon caps, the Energy Department has made it clear that it intends to push the development of integrated gasification combined-cycle technology. Last month, for example, Mark Maddox, a deputy assistant secretary, said at an industry gathering that the technology "is needed in the mix—needed now."

Some industry leaders are skeptical, to say the least. "We would not want to put all of our eggs in one basket as far as a single technology is concerned," said William Fang, deputy counsel for the Edison Electric Institute, a trade association whose members, shareholder-owned utilities, account for three-quarters of the country's generating capacity.

Besides, he added, many of his members think that mandatory carbon controls, in

place in much of the world since the Kyoto Protocol came into force in February, can be kept at bay in the United States—possibly indefinitely.

It's a risky strategy—for industry and for the climate. "Coal-fired plants are big targets," said Judi Greenwald of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change, "and if we do get serious about climate change, they are going to be on the list of things to do quite early."

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2005.

Hon. SKILA HARRIS,
Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, TN.

Hon. BILL BAXTER,
Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, TN.

DEAR SKILA AND BILL: Recently Sen. John Warner of Virginia and I introduced the "Environmentally Responsible Windpower Act" which would:

1. Stop federal subsidies for giant windmills near highly scenic areas, such as the Great Smokies and Grand Canyon, and

2. Give communities a 120-day opportunity to have some say in whether and where these huge machines will be located in their communities and neighborhoods.

Today I am writing to ask that TVA place a two-year moratorium on construction of new wind farms—either by TVA or on TVA-controlled land—until the new TVA board, Congress and local officials can evaluate the impact of these massive structures on our electric rates, our view of the mountains and our tourism industry. The governors of Kansas and New Jersey have recently imposed similar moratoria. Local moratoria have been adopted in parts of Vermont and Wisconsin.

The idea of windmills conjures up pleasant images—of Holland and tulips, of rural America with windmill blades slowly turning, pumping water at the farm well. My grandparents had such a windmill at their well pump.

But these are not your grandmother's windmills.

Most new windmills are about 300 feet high—as tall as a football field is long or as tall as the Statue of Liberty. Their rotor blades are wider than the wingspan of a 747 jumbo jet and turn at up to 100 miles per hour. Each tower costs more than \$1 million to erect, and, once constructed, the towers will be around for a long time. For example, TVA's new 18-windmill farm on Buffalo Mountain is a 20-year contract.

Only one of these giant windmills could fit into UT's Neyland stadium. It would rise more than twice as high as the highest skybox, its rotor blades would stretch almost from 10-yard line to 10-yard line, and on a clear night its flashing red lights could be seen for 20 miles—the distance from Knoxville to Maryville. Usually these windmills are grouped in windfarms of 20 or more.

Our country needs a national clean energy policy, not a national windmill policy. TVA is a national leader in producing clean energy through nuclear and hydroelectric power. A moratorium on windmills would give Tennesseans two years to stop and think about the wisdom and cost of building hundreds of 100-yard tall structures across our most scenic ridges.

Here are some of the facts I have gathered so far:

There are 6,700 windmills in the United States today; by 2025, that number could grow to somewhere between 40,000 and 100,000, according to varying estimates.

Even if only a few hundred of those windmills are built in Tennessee, most will be built on top of mountain ridges according to Senate testimony by Kerry W. Bowers, Technology Manager of Southern Company. That could damage our tourism industry.

These giant windmills are being built primarily because of a huge federal taxpayer subsidy, about \$3 billion over the next five years if present policies continue. Without these federal tax breaks, American Wind Energy Association statistics suggest that three out of four windmills would not be built across the country because they aren't cost-effective producers of power.

Once those tax credits expire, TVA rate-payers would likely have to pick up most of the tab for the higher cost of the power.

These windmills may be huge, but they don't produce much power. It would take at least 1,300 windmills—covering the land mass of almost one and one half times the city of Knoxville—to produce as much power as TVA's new Brown's Ferry nuclear plant.

Because they only work when the wind blows the right speed (20 to 40 percent of the time), and customers need their electricity almost all the time, building more windmills does not mean building fewer coal or nuclear power plants.

Since windy ridgetops are not usually where the largest number of people live, windmills are likely to be built away from population centers and therefore require the building of miles of new transmission lines through neighborhoods and communities.

So, these oversized windmills produce a puny amount of unreliable power in a way that costs more than coal or nuclear power, requires new transmission lines, must be subsidized by massive federal tax breaks, and, in my view, destroys the landscape.

Chattanooga has just spent 20 years improving its waterfront, saving the Tennessee River Gorge and renaming itself the Scenic City. The Great Smoky Mountains attract 10 million visitors a year. Do we really now want to string hundreds of towers with flashing red lights as tall as football fields on Signal and Lookout Mountains, the foothills of the Smokies and Roan Mountain? It's hard to imagine that 10 million visitors would come to the foothills of the Smokies each year to see windmills.

As chairman of the Senate Energy Subcommittee, I intend to examine whether it is wise to provide \$3 billion in subsidies over the next five years for the building of tens of thousands of giant windmills across America, when the same amount of money might, for example, give \$1,000 incentives to more than 300,000 purchasers of hybrid or advanced diesel vehicles. As chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority Congressional Caucus, I intend to do my best to make local officials aware of their options to decide for themselves whether these structures belong in their communities.

Our country needs lower prices for energy and an adequate supply of low-cost, reliable American-produced clean energy. Wind doesn't fit the bill: it is a high-cost, unreliable supply of energy. While we are considering what the appropriate policies should be, I hope that TVA will help by placing a two-year moratorium on any new wind farms.

Sincerely,

LAMAR ALEXANDER,
United States Senator.

[From The Observer, May 22, 2005]

TILTING AT WINDMILLS: NATION SPLIT OVER ENERGY EYESORES

(By Mark Townsend)

Hundreds of turbines will be switched on this year, and the volume of protest is rising. Mark Townsend reports on the issue that will overtake hunting as a cause of rural unrest.

The clue lies in the grass, pummelled and then flattened by a force the area is famous for. Whinash is all about wind, and it is a re-

source which has put the Lakeland beauty spot at the heart of Britain's debate about the country's insatiable need for energy.

The site—amid the classic Cumbrian vista of rolling fells criss-crossed with dry stone walls and the shuffling specks of sheep—is to be home to England's largest wind farm. If the plans ever get the go-ahead.

This week, the public inquiry to site 27 turbines, each almost the height of St. Paul's Cathedral, on the ridge of Whinash enters its most potentially explosive phase. Two of Cumbria's favourite sons, the broadcaster Melvyn Bragg and the mountaineer Sir Chris Bonington, are scheduled to give evidence in the squat Garden Room of the remote Shap Wells Hotel. There can be no place for 21st-century windmills in a Wilderness largely-unaltered for centuries, they will argue.

Almost 200 miles north in Aberdeen, Malcolm Wicks will mark his entrance as the new energy minister by stressing the crucial role of wind power in the crusade against climate change. Only weeks into his new brief, Wicks appreciates that wind farms are already eclipsing farming and foxhunting as the most likely source of rural unrest during Labour's third term.

Ministers, aware that the government's target of cutting carbon dioxide emissions is in jeopardy, have identified Whinash as the acid test of whether they can expect that renewable energy will provide 10 percent of power in five years' time.

But the significance of Whinash runs even deeper. Among the windblown crags that lie between the national parks of the Lake District and the Yorkshire Dales, the schism that is tearing Britain's environmental movement from top to bottom is most pronounced.

The self-appointed custodian for future generations, Britain's green lobby has found itself caught between the need to protect the landscape from global warming and defending Britain's countryside from the creation of a 'pseudo-industrial' skyline. This month, one of the movement's most influential figures James Lovelock, the man who developed the Gaia theory of the forces governing nature, will launch his most candid critique yet of Britain's energy conundrum by accusing groups such as Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth of betraying the planet through their unswerving promotion of wind energy.

Nuclear energy, Lovelock will claim, offers the only solution to the twin challenges of providing Britain with a reliable energy supply and global warming.

Britain currently stands poised at the start of the 'wind rush'. Hundreds more turbines in 18 new wind farms will be switched on by the end of the year. Already the UK is poised to become the world's biggest producer of power from offshore wind farms, a reminder of the 17th century, when Britain boasted 90,000 windmills.

Around one per cent of the UK's energy is currently provided by wind although the Industry claims there are enough applications moving through the planning process to suggest seven per cent of the nation's electricity needs will be met by wind by 2010.

Next month the 300ft turbines at Cefn Croes, scene of the bitterest wrangle before Whinash, will start turning in mid-Wales. Yet pressure is mounting on the fledgling industry. If Britain's climate change targets are not met, experts warn that the generous subsidies which have helped establish wind farms could be withdrawn by an exasperated government.

Already a new era for nuclear power appears to be dawning and seems certain to feature prominently in the government's forthcoming energy review. Vastly more expensive than predicted and plagued by per-

sistent safety concerns, nuclear's strength remains its proven reliability. And even those who have lived in the shadow of Sellafield, 30 miles west across central Lakeland from Whinash, are beginning to believe nuclear is the saviour.

Sir Christopher Audland shook his head as he tramped along the pummelled cotton grass tufts of the Whinash site last Tuesday afternoon. A former director-general of energy for the European Commission, Audland was in charge when reactor number four exploded in the Ukraine almost 20 years ago, its radioactive contents drifting from Chernobyl to the fells of Cumbria where his family has lived for 500 years. For a man who saw first-hand the inherent risk of nuclear power, Audland is dismissive of the safer alternative proposed for the hills north of Kendal. 'It cannot be allowed to happen here,' he said.

Bragg, who has relatives who happily work at Sellafield, is among the growing Lakeland fraternity who believes nuclear is the sale viable option for tackling climate change.

'We seem to be running away from the safest, most efficient industry. Nuclear energy seems to be the only sensible option and it is a safe option,' said the presenter of The South Bank Show. It is a consensus corroborated by Lovelock, who in 1991 opened Britain's first windfarm at Delabole, Cornwall. Since then, Lovelock has reviewed his initial enthusiasm.

'To phase out nuclear energy just when we need it most to combat global warming is madness,' he said. 'The anti-nuclear agenda is pushed by groups such as Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth and by Green Party politicians. They are pursuing goals in which neither environmental good sense nor science plays a part—a strange way to defend the earth,' he writes in Reader's Digest.

Even the spectre of Chernobyl is dismissed by Lovelock, who claims that the fallout from the radioactive cloud that swept over the Cumbrian peaks 'was really nothing. A few times higher than the natural background levels or at worst a couple of chest X-rays'.

It is 13 years since the arrival of the anti-wind lobby surfaced with the Country Guardian, a group that vehemently denies links to the nuclear sector although its chairman, Sir Bernard Ingham, has been a paid lobbyist for British Nuclear Fuels. Since then, complaints advanced to discredit wind energy have multiplied: falling property prices, the whirring noise that makes people sick a mile away, horses that suddenly bolt and the grisly deaths of kites and golden eagles, even if their numbers are a fraction of those of birds that are killed on the roads.

The most persistent criticism, however, concerns the efficiency of wind power. Critics claim windmills would struggle to cope with the half-time power surge during yesterday's FA Cup final because they only generate electricity for a part of the time. Such issues would be irrelevant if electricity could be stored, but there is no battery for the national grid.

A recent study in Germany, which has the largest number of wind farms in the world, found the energy was an expensive and inefficient way of generating sustainable energy, costing up to £53 to avoid emitting a ton of carbon dioxide. Professor David Bellamy, a vociferous windfarm critic seen recently at the Shap Wells Hotel, is among those worried whether wind could guarantee his half-time cuppa: 'How are people going to be able to boil their kettles?'

Sir Martin Holdgate, a former chief scientist to the Department of Environment who has served on a number of government committees on renewable energy, was also present in the Garden Room last week. Holdgate, too, has run out of patience with

wind farms in sensitive areas. 'We shouldn't sacrifice our landscape on our crowded island. Wind doesn't make sense.'

Others, the so-called 'blade lovers', welcome them as an aesthetic asset, claiming that their beauty lies in the environmental message they communicate to a throwaway society. Designer Wayne Hemingway says: 'I love them. They are a massive visual sign that we are doing something that is not damaging the Earth.'

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority controls 50 minutes of the time remaining.

Mr. KERRY. Fifty?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am told 50.

Mr. KERRY. How much does the majority have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority controls 52 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I will use at this moment. Obviously, I will not use all of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator controls 30 minutes of the time allocated.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am not sure how much of that time I will use.

I have made a significant amount of argument, as others have, in the Foreign Relations Committee during the time leading up to this debate on the floor. I listened to Senator BIDEN's comments and I listened to Senator BIDEN's colloquy with Senator SARBANES. They raised critical points, as have others, such as Senator DODD and Senator VOINOVICH, and others on the floor. I am not sure it serves any great purpose to rehash all of those arguments, but I will say in summary that what brings a lot of us to this point of questioning the nomination of John Bolton is not personal and it is not political in the sense that it is sort of an automatic reflex reaction to a nomination of the President, or to divisions between the parties.

I think people can sense from the bipartisan concerns that have been expressed, as well as the record that has been set forward, that these are really deeply felt and very legitimate concerns about a position that is one of the most important foreign policy positions for our country.

Obviously, the President has the right to make a choice. We all understand that. Subsequent to the President making that choice, an enormous amount of information has come forward, not from traditional sources, not from people who might have been disposed to oppose this nomination, but

from people who have worked with Mr. Bolton, from people who are ideologically in the same place as he is, who are members of the same administration.

The picture they have painted is clearly one that ought to raise concern for any Member of the Senate about a position that requires special credibility, special stature, and special ability to be able to carry the message of our country in one of the most important fora in the world, in a very complicated world.

On several occasions, a number of Senators have talked about this issue of credibility, and it cannot be overlooked. One cannot gloss by it. We are in the midst of delicate, critical negotiations with Iran. Nobody knows where that will go in these next months. The potential for critical intelligence analysis to be put before the United Nations in order to persuade the world of potentially dangerous steps requires a voice that has no questions attached to it, where people will not have to ask whether that person speaks for the administration or for themselves.

The history of Secretary Colin Powell, whom we all admire but who was sent to the United Nations with information that was inaccurate and made a speech which he now personally wishes were otherwise, raises even further the question of credibility. In addition, we will have to deal with Syria itself where important issues have been raised with respect to Mr. Bolton's attitude toward Syria, his willingness to stretch information with respect to Syria. Obviously, North Korea looms huge on the diplomatic and security horizon.

All of this fits within a context of information that the Foreign Relations Committee has requested a number of times. Two weeks ago, the Foreign Relations Committee, in a historical moment, voted to send John Bolton's nomination without recommendation. I voted no at that time for the reasons that I stated, and I believe we have yet to complete the task of building the complete record to be able to have the full Senate make a judgment on this nomination.

Over the last 24 years, the Foreign Relations Committee has sent hundreds of nominations to the floor with favorable recommendations. Only twice did the committee report a nomination unfavorably, and only once did it report a nomination without recommendation. So obviously we come with serious reservations within the committee, and the Senate ought to want a full record to be put in front of it before it votes on this nomination.

The power of advice and consent has been talked about a lot in the last weeks. Obviously, we have a constitutional responsibility not just to advise but also to consent, and nowhere is it suggested in the Constitution that we ought to consent automatically.

So over the last week, both Democrats and Republicans on the com-

mittee have worked hard together to jointly interview more than 30 individuals with information relevant to this nomination. We also requested numerous documents from the State Department, USAID, and the CIA. This in-depth level of investigation was necessary because concerns were raised by individuals in Government and in the private sector about the nomination. Again, I repeat, we did not seek out these people. They came to us. Most of those who came to us have worked with Mr. Bolton and continue to work in Government. They came to us at great risk to themselves. That risk has to be measured by our colleagues in the Senate.

Everybody knows how this place works. We know the difficulty of a person coming out of the same place of business in politics and saying something that is critical of somebody they worked with. The fact is that we owe those people who took those risks a serious and complete effort in the consideration of this nomination, not a perfunctory effort, not one that seeks to find a way around a legitimate request for information.

The fact is that this administration's cooperation in the Foreign Relations Committee's effort to do due diligence on the Bolton nomination has been sporadic at best and far from complete. In the 22 years I have served on the committee, I have seen efforts on both sides of the aisle that have been far more extensive and far lengthier for less important positions or for the similar position.

Initially, the administration's response was to refuse access to documents or individuals to be interviewed until just a few days before the committee's first business meeting to consider the Bolton nomination on April 19. Chairman LUGAR had to personally intervene in order to persuade the administration to comply with earlier requests that were made repeatedly by Senator BIDEN on behalf of all of the Democrats on the committee.

The State Department finally responded but, again, not fully. It did not provide all of the documents requested, and those that were provided were suddenly deemed to be classified, even though many were unclassified e-mails.

After the committee decided on April 19 to further investigate allegations and concerns about this nomination, the administration continued to drag its feet on the Democratic request for information. On April 29, Senator BIDEN sent a letter specifying nine different categories of documents relating to the issues of concern that needed to be investigated thoroughly. Some of these requests involved additional information related to specific cases the committee had been reviewing. Four of them were requests for drafts of speeches or testimony. These four requests were designed to ascertain whether Mr. Bolton sought to stretch the intelligence to support his policy views. A lot has been spoken on the

Senate floor about that effort to stretch, and I would associate myself with the concerns that have been expressed by other Senators about that effort. There is nothing more serious at this moment in time.

The State Department refused to respond fully to Senator BIDEN's request. Instead, it responded to a letter by Chairman LUGAR on May 4 suggesting that it needed to provide documents in only five of the nine categories. Well, it is not up to the administration to decide which categories are appropriate for the proper advice and consent of a Senate committee or of the Senate itself.

So in an effort to move the process along and get further cooperation from the administration, Senator BIDEN narrowed the Democratic request down to two areas: Information related to the clearance of Mr. Bolton's September 2003 testimony on Syria before the House International Relations Committee and information related to National Security Agency intercepts and the identity of U.S. persons on those intercepts.

Over a period of 4 years, Mr. Bolton requested the identity of U.S. persons on intercepts 10 times.

Senator DODD originally asked for these intercepts in a question for the record on April 11. The Department responded by saying that the committee needed to get these from the National Security Agency. So Chairman LUGAR supported the Democratic request for the NSA intercepts but asked the Intelligence Committee to request them and find a means of sharing them with the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Intelligence Committee finally did get the intercepts, but the chairman and ranking member of that committee were not allowed to see the key information; that is, the names of the U.S. persons, which is an essential part of the evaluation of the committee. No one—no one on the Foreign Relations Committee, not Chairman LUGAR or Senator BIDEN—has been given access to these intercepts.

In response to letters from Senator BIDEN regarding the intercepts, the Director of National Intelligence, Ambassador Negroponte, referred Senator BIDEN back to the Intelligence Committee.

What the Senate has to decide is whether it is going to stand up for the rights of a committee, for the rights of an appropriate set of inquiries to be answered so we can fulfill our constitutional responsibilities. Senators can be for Mr. Bolton, Senators can have already made up their minds, Senators can have decided that they know how they are going to vote and they do not need more information, but they ought to respect the fact that both the chairman and the ranking member made a request and that request has not yet been fulfilled.

The information we are seeking relating to the Syria testimony will shed further light on whether Mr. Bolton

tried to press the envelope on intelligence and whether he told the committee the truth when he said he was not personally involved in the preparation of the Syria testimony. The question of whether Mr. Bolton told the committee the truth is important because there are already several other instances where it is in doubt, where in fact there is clear evidence that he didn't tell the truth, specifically with respect to the efforts to fire the two analysts of intelligence.

Stretching intelligence and credibility are two of the key areas of concern with respect to the Bolton nomination, two of the key areas of inquiry that the committee is seeking. This is a proper and a critical request. Having access to the NSA intercepts will tell us whether Mr. Bolton did anything improper after receiving the identities of U.S. persons involved. The fact they do not want anybody to see it seems to suggest the exact opposite.

Senator ROBERTS, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, indicated in his letter to Senators LUGAR and BIDEN that on at least one occasion Mr. Bolton shared the identity information of a U.S. person with another individual in the State Department without authorization from NSA.

Did he do this more than once? Why did he request these intercepts? What was he trying to find out? What was he going to do, or did he do with the information? We can only speculate without proper access to those intercepts and without knowing the identities of the persons on them.

The State Department has told the committee that the request for information about the Syria testimony is not "specifically tied to the issues being deliberated by the committee." But for the executive branch of Government, which has already been slow-walking this provision of information, to tell a Senate committee how to exercise the advice and consent power of the Senate is not only unacceptable, it is unconstitutional. The Foreign Relations Committee has the prerogative to determine, and has laid out for our colleagues to judge, the legitimacy of the basis of this request. I think it passes muster.

For the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee to be denied access to NSA intercepts and information which Mr. Bolton was able to see is unacceptable on its face. An Assistant Secretary of State and staff are permitted to see this, but the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee are not? Is the Senate prepared to ratify that as a standard by which we will have our inquiries pursued with respect to any nomination on either side at any time?

The Foreign Relations Committee has spent an enormous amount of time and energy related to this nomination. Grudgingly, cherry-picking document requests, we have proceeded along with the administration actually denying other requests entirely.

The information we continue to seek is relevant to this nomination and to the critical concerns that many of us have about the nominee and his use of intelligence. We should have access. Since the administration has refused to provide it, the only choice we have is to deny the vote on this nomination until there is full compliance. That is not a filibuster. That is not an effort to not have a vote. Give us the information. We are prepared to have a vote immediately and let the chips fall where they may. But it is vital that the rights of the committee and the rights of the Senate, the rights of the advice and consent process, be upheld.

Let me just say again this should not be anything except a measurement on the merits. During her confirmation hearing in 1981, to be U.S. ambassador to the U.N., Jeane Kirkpatrick described her vision of the job. She said:

I do not think that one should ever seek confrontation. What I have every intention and hope of doing is to operate in a low key, quiet, persuasive, and consensus-building way. I think a principal objective should be to try to communicate effectively with the representatives of as many nations as possible to broaden a bit the areas of mutual understanding. We should try to extend a bit the frontiers of reason and cooperation, and I think we should work to that end, and we should work to establish the patterns of consultation and trust.

No one would ever accuse Jeane Kirkpatrick of being soft or shying away from her views. She is a staunch conservative who speaks her mind. But she understood and respected the value of diplomacy and negotiation; of listening to and respecting others' views; of working the system; of seeing the big picture and, most importantly, of establishing credibility and trust. She herself has said of this nominee that he is "no diplomat."

We should make the judgment in the end of whether this is the right person. I have heard colleagues argue how important it is to have a straight-talking, tough person at the U.N. This is not about the U.N. per se, obviously. It is about our interests and how we are going to best advance those interests. But those of us who spent a long time trying to reform the U.N. and working with it, and have had some success in some measure with respect to that effort, in a bipartisan effort going back to the time we worked with Nancy Kassebaum and Larry Pressler and Jesse Helms, all of us understood you need to establish those patterns of consultation and trust and speak with credibility.

I regret that this process has proven that this nominee does not meet the Jeane Kirkpatrick standard or test, and therefore all of us ought to raise serious questions about the nomination.

I think my time is about up, so 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. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFFEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, what is the current time on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 28 minutes and the majority has exactly 1 hour.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, will the quorum be tallied to both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, that is correct.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator VOINOVICH allowing me to speak a moment or two on the John Bolton nomination.

No. 1, when it comes to how and why Members vote, every Senator has to make a decision they feel comfortable with, that is good for the Nation, good for the Senate, good for the White House, good for the American people.

One thing I am confident of: Senator VOINOVICH, of all the people I know in the Senate, is right at the top of the list of those who make decisions based on conscience and principle. Whatever problems he has with this nominee have come from soul searching, thinking, and looking. He will articulate why he feels the way he does and vote his conscience. That is exactly what he should do. I am all for that because that is what makes the Senate great. That is what makes America great.

In terms of myself, I would like a moment or two to express why I have come to the conclusion that I think John Bolton will make an outstanding ambassador to the United Nations. We have heard a lot about his disposition, about his temper, about his working relations. Everyone will make a judgment about where they come down on that. I made a judgment that, obviously, some of the things about his working relationships can be troubling. The idea that he has been confirmed four times, has served his country for well over 20 years in a variety of posts and done an outstanding job, is what I will base my vote on—not a conversation here or there but 20-plus years of serving the United States at the highest level of Government, with a great academic background.

But why him and why now? Are there other people who can be United States ambassador to the United Nations? There are a lot of good people out there. What drove the President to pick him now? The honest truth is, I haven't talked to the President about why he picked John Bolton, but I have

a pretty good idea what was on his mind. The President sees very clearly the need for the United Nations. This world is in tremendous conflict. We are splitting along religious lines. We are having all kinds of problems getting along with each other and trying to find out how to fight the war on terrorism. The United Nations provides a hope for the world, a place where we can come together and have good people stand up to bad people. Sometimes it is hard to determine who is good and who is bad, but many times it is not, and it should be a place where people of good will can deal with problems for bad people such as Saddam Hussein and others, the Osama bin Ladens of the world, a place where they can be controlled and checked.

The President sees from the American conservative perspective that the United Nations has lost its way. From a conservative point of view, being a conservative Republican, I hear continuously of problems with the United Nations from people I represent and people I know. The worst thing we can do is to allow the good will of the American people to slip away from the United Nations and reject that body.

What will it take to repair the damage done from the Oil-for-Food Program, the corruption at the United Nations, the, at the least, inconsistent approach to regulating dictators such as Saddam Hussein? How can we get the United States and the United Nations back together where we can work as one team? It will take a person Americans have faith in. And that is a big problem with the United Nations right now.

American conservatives need to feel better. John Bolton will provide that assurance from a conservative point of view that the United Nations would be pushed to reform itself. From a moderate and liberal point of view, I can assure members that the policies John Bolton will fight for will be those policies directed by President Bush, who won the last election. And some may not agree with the policies, but that is where he will get his marching orders.

He sees the United Nations as a value-added product to the world. He sees clearly where it has gone astray. He has the credibility with the American public, particularly among conservatives, to be a force for change.

The worst thing that could happen is for the United Nations to slip away, in the eyes of Americans, as an effective body. It surely has gone that route.

The best thing that can happen from this nomination is that John Bolton goes to the U.N. with an attitude of: I will work with you, but you have to be better—and to effectively articulate President Bush's policies. I think that can happen. I think it must happen. Not only am I enthusiastic about his nomination, he clearly—given the dynamic our country has with the United Nations—is the right person at the right time and can do things no other person could do; namely, repair the

image of the U.N. with a large percentage of the American people, who believe it has lost its way. That is why I will support this nominee with enthusiasm.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his kind remarks about this Senator early today and this afternoon.

What we are doing here today is what the Senate should be doing; that is, to have a robust debate about a nominee by the President of the United States to the United Nations.

I have deep concerns about the nomination of John Bolton. We face an important decision today. We are at a crossroads in foreign policy, at a time when there has been a drastic shift in the attitude of our friends and allies. If we do have a vote today, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to let their consciences and their commitment to our Nation's best interests guide them.

I would plead with them to consider the decision and its consequences carefully, to read the pertinent information, and to ask themselves several important questions:

Is John Bolton the best person to serve as the lead diplomat to the United Nations?

Will he be able to pursue the needed reforms at the U.N. despite his damaged credibility?

Will he share information with the right individuals, and will he solicit information from the right individuals, including his subordinates, so he can make the most informed decisions?

Is he capable of advancing the President's and the Secretary of State's efforts to advance our public diplomacy?

Does he have the character, leadership, interpersonal skills, self-discipline, common decency, and understanding of the chain of command to lead a team to victory?

Will he recognize and seize opportunities to repair and strengthen relationships, promote peace, and uphold democracy with our fellow nations?

I also came to the floor today to respond to some of the statements that have been made regarding the nomination of Mr. Bolton.

It has been argued by my colleagues that Mr. Bolton is the right man for the job because he has "sharp elbows," can give a dose of needed "strong medicine," and because he will not be an "appeaser" to the horrors that have been committed by the U.N. peacekeepers.

The question is not whether we want to achieve U.N. reforms. We will support U.N. reforms. And I particularly want U.N. reforms. We need to pursue its transformation aggressively, sending a strong message that corruption will not be tolerated. The corruption that occurred under the Oil-for-Food Program made it possible for Saddam's

Iraq to discredit the U.N. and undermine the goal of all of its members. This must never happen again. This is an ideal time for reform of the United Nations. Those reforms are needed to strengthen the organization or there will not be an organization.

And, yes, I believe it will be necessary to take a firm position so it can succeed. But it is going to take a special individual to succeed in this endeavor, and I have great concerns with the current nominee and his ability to get the job done. How successful will he be on reform if the message is lost because of baggage surrounding the messenger? I worry that Mr. Bolton will become the issue and the message will be lost.

I understand the arguments just made by my colleague from South Carolina in regard to the conservative movement here in the United States that is very concerned about the U.N. and feels comfortable that if John Bolton goes to the U.N., with his "sharp elbows," something is going to happen.

I would like to point out that Mr. Bolton will be going to the U.N. to do more than just push forward U.N. reforms with his "sharp elbows." He is there to be the U.S. representative to the world.

Do we want the supreme quality for our next U.S. representative to the world to be "sharp elbows"? Don't we need a man who has superior interpersonal skills, who can bring people together, form coalitions, and inspire other countries to agree with his point of view?

To the conservatives who are concerned about reform of the United Nations, do we want the messenger to become the issue so we never get to the message? And the message is: reform.

I agree the next Ambassador needs to be a strong presence, firm in his beliefs, persistent in his drive, and determined in the face of a monolithic bureaucracy and many obstructionist countries. It is not going to be easy. But even more than this, he will need the interpersonal and diplomatic skills required to inspire and lead.

If you think about John Danforth, our last ambassador to the United Nations—or let's talk about John Negroponte. Let's put John Negroponte and John Bolton in the same room together, colleagues. Put them in the same room together. John Negroponte went to the U.N. and did an outstanding job. John Negroponte was taken from the U.N. The President needed somebody in Iraq, so he sent John Negroponte to Iraq. Then he needed to call on someone to be the Director of the National Intelligence area. Now, John Negroponte—that is the quality of the individual who we need to be sending to the United Nations today.

One of my colleagues stated earlier today that we should not reject Mr. Bolton because of his management techniques because "management is

not a criterion for rejecting a nominee and if it were, a lot of nominees would have been rejected."

In the case of Mr. Bolton, his poor management techniques intimidated intelligence officers and have called U.S. credibility into question, at a time when we cannot afford any further damage to our credibility. That is one of the problems we have today—the WMD and Iraq, some of the recent stories about the WMD. There are a lot of people who are questioning this Nation's credibility.

Further, his management and interpersonal failures reflect on his diplomatic skills, which are an undeniable requirement for the ambassador to the United Nations.

Colin Powell's chief of staff, COL Lawrence Wilkerson, testified before the committee that Mr. Bolton would make "an abysmal ambassador" because of his management flaws.

I would like to read from Mr. Wilkerson's testimony.

Mr. Wilkinson:

I would like to make just one statement. I don't have a large problem with Under Secretary Bolton serving our country. My objections to what we've been talking about here—that is, him being our ambassador at the United Nations—stem from two basic things. One, I think he's a lousy leader. And there are 100 to 150 people up there that have to be led; they have to be led well, and they have to be led properly. And I think, in that capacity, if he goes up there, you'll see the proof of the pudding in a year.

It has been argued during our floor debate that many of the people who oppose Mr. Bolton's nomination originally supported Mr. Bolton and voted for him several times before they heard about these new allegations against him.

The statement seems to argue that many allegations about John Bolton are not relevant to our decision on whether he is the right man for the job and should be confirmed as the next ambassador to the United Nations.

The allegations about Mr. Bolton are very relevant to our decision. The allegations speak to Mr. Bolton's character, his temperament, his credibility, his management style, his skills, and his performance over the last 4 years.

The testimony of our witnesses has certainly had an impact on my opinion.

I expect that the allegations have had an incredible impact on the world's opinion of Mr. Bolton. I believe that the allegations have caused great damage to Mr. Bolton's credibility and that the allegations will impair our influence with the United Nations. If Mr. Bolton is confirmed for the position, he goes to the U.N. with a tremendous amount of baggage that he is going to have to overcome. Again, I want to repeat to the people who feel he is just the right ticket to get the job done, I am very concerned that he will become the issue and the reform of the United Nations that we all would like to see is not going to happen.

It has also been stated today that none of the incidents involving intel-

ligence resulted in misuse. This is all of the testimony about speeches that Mr. Bolton gave. I guess my colleagues believe that the misuse of intelligence would have only occurred if Mr. Bolton would have been successful in clearing the language that he originally insisted upon. In other words, he would have these ideas about the world and about intelligence and said: This is what I want to say. And the intelligence folks came back and said: No, you can't say that because that doesn't reflect the reality. And everyone says that is not a problem because ultimately he didn't say what he wanted to say because he got the better information from the intelligence officers.

The misuse of intelligence occurs as a process. It begins with intimidation and pressure on analysts, and it ends with analysts producing reports that meet the political needs of top leadership. Mr. Bolton contributed to this process with his actions. He created an atmosphere of intimidation within the ranks of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research and at the CIA. The people in these agencies were made to understand that if they disagreed with him, there would be consequences. His actions sent the message that if you don't seek to meet his particular request for specific language, they may be sidelined from future opportunities to provide him intelligence, and they may even be pulled off of the account and moved to another bureau.

The Presiding Officer was there for some of the hearings. There was no question that the message was, if you disagree with him, you might get moved to some other place. Some have argued that you would be fired. But it wasn't in this language; it was like "moved to somewhere else." It is the same signal, same message: Don't fool with John because, if you do, he is going to put pressure on to move you to some other place.

His behavior put pressure on the intelligence officers, and it begins the very dangerous path to misusing intelligence and damaging U.S. credibility. The point Senator KERRY made earlier this afternoon is well taken. We all know there is a real problem with Iran. We know that the International Atomic Energy Agency is very concerned about what is going on in Iran today. We are hopeful that the EU-3 will be able to work out the problem and deal with the proliferation problem in Iran. But they may not be successful. If they are not, you know where they are going. They are going to the U.N. Security Council. Can you imagine if the spokesman for the United States at the U.N. Security Council about intelligence and the impact of whether Iran has this or that, if the spokesman is going to be John Bolton? Can you imagine how much influence he is going to have with his past record? It is a serious issue, one we hope doesn't happen, but it could very well happen. And there will be other instances that come before the United Nations where

the credibility of the individual representing us is going to make an enormous amount of difference if we are to be successful.

I agree with Mr. Bolton's policies. I believe in U.N. reform. I believe in non-proliferation. I believe in working to secure Article 98 agreements to protect U.S. forces against trial by the International Criminal Court, although I do not agree with his decision to hold up important military education in order to achieve that goal. I believe in removing the anti-Israel prejudices in the United Nations. I believe in reforming the anticorruption and enforcement mechanisms of the United Nations. I believe in preventing abuses and crimes by U.N. peacekeepers. I believe in making the United Nations a strong institution that fulfills its mission to preserve and protect human rights and democracy. I know that I agree with Mr. Bolton's policy because I sat down with him to discuss his policies. I still just believe we can do much better than Mr. Bolton at the United Nations.

Many people have come today to defend Mr. Bolton. In some cases, they argue that the allegations are false. In some cases, they argue that even though Mr. Bolton behaved badly, his rough edges are what the United States needs to be successful at the U.N., so we should overlook his record of behavior. But nobody has disputed the argument that I made yesterday before the Senate that Mr. Bolton will contradict our efforts to improve public diplomacy at this critical time.

Public diplomacy has been the No. 1 priority of Secretary Rice since becoming Secretary of State. She is running all over the world putting her best foot forward, saying: We are the team. We all have to work together. It is a clear priority of the President, who has done everything in his power to improve the image and understanding of the United States, including getting the First Lady to get out there and start doing public diplomacy and then naming Karen Hughes, his confidant for so many years, to lead public diplomacy at the Department of State.

In the spirit of the President's objectives, we cannot ignore the damage that John Bolton could have on U.S. public diplomacy. We also cannot ignore the warning signs of so many loyal servants of our Government who testified before our committee. These witnesses who came before the Foreign Relations Committee came voluntarily. We didn't go out and solicit them to come. They came in voluntarily. Most of them are Republicans. Most of them are proud they are conservatives.

I ask my colleagues to consider these questions: When was the last time so many individuals have come out in opposition to a nomination? Think about it. When was the last time that 102 diplomats have opposed the appointment of a new ambassador? I should check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It hasn't

happened since I have been here, and I am in my seventh year. When was the last time so many witnesses have emerged from an administration to send warning signals to the Congress about an individual? When was the last time a Secretary of State did not sign the letter of recommendation for a nominee? It would have been a lay-up shot for Secretary Powell to join that letter recommending Mr. Bolton to be our ambassador to the United Nations, but his name was absent from the letter. And who best to understand whether he is the kind of individual we should send to the U.N. to be our ambassador?

It is rare, and it should serve as a warning to all of us. We owe it to the United States, our children and grandchildren, to heed this warning and to ask our President: Mr. President, please, find a better candidate to send to the United Nations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, again, I commend my friend and colleague. I don't want to do this too frequently. I am afraid I may hurt his reputation in certain quarters. I want to tell him how much I admire what he has done over the last number of weeks and did so so that the people of Ohio and America understand this. This was not a decision that my colleague from Ohio reached quickly. In fact, I recall vividly the day in room 116 where we made our case. It was one of those rare moments that we don't see often enough around here these days, where the Senator from Ohio said: I am troubled by this. I want to know more.

I was tempted a couple of times during the period between that hearing on April 18 or 19 and when we reconvened again in early May as part of the Foreign Relations Committee to consider this nomination. I decided the best thing I could do was to leave the Senator from Ohio alone and let him go through the process himself of deciding on the concerns that had been raised. As he so appropriately pointed out—I tried to make the point this morning myself—these allegations are not coming from some outside groups who have a vested political interest in the outcome.

Many of these people were people who were presently there or have just left the present administration or they have had the experience of working with the nominee. They were the ones who raised the concerns. In fact, at lunch today, we were talking about North Korea with several former career diplomats who have worked with the nominee, including in this administration. I asked them for any observations. They confirmed what the Senator has said.

They had complimentary things to say about Mr. Bolton, as well. I am not saying there are not qualities about this nominee that are good. He is certainly a well-educated individual, and

he has an incredibly attractive life story of where he has come from. But they all made the same point the Senator from Ohio made, and it deserves being made again. I raised the issue about the intelligence analyst. But the Senator is absolutely correct. In this day and age, what we have been through over the last several years, having people who can help us take unwilling nations that may be cautious about joining us in certain things, for all the reasons we are familiar with, and to be able to build those coalitions around issues critical to us and to peace and stability in the world, is going to be absolutely essential. The U.N. is a forum particularly for smaller nations.

Large nations have big delegations here in Washington, and we go back and forth to major European allies and the major countries in the Pacific rim. For an awful lot of countries, the best forum for them is the U.N. The person who interfaces with those people on a daily basis can do a tremendous amount of good for our country with that notion—the face of public diplomacy that the Senator from Ohio talked about.

I wanted to, once again, thank my colleague for his willingness to share his feelings with his colleagues about this, and we are going to have a vote this afternoon, only because I felt it was important for us to be able to have information that should be forthcoming. It is a matter of right here on a cloture motion and, if that succeeds, we will go right to a vote on Mr. Bolton. If not, it will lay over and when we get back, if we don't invoke cloture, we will deal with it fairly quickly when we return and we will move on.

I hope Members will have listened, particularly on the majority side. I suspect that when you hear some of us, you may say that is a bunch of Democrats talking. I regret that that is the feeling, but if you are not impressed with what some of us who have worked on the issues for many years feel about it, listen to GEORGE VOINOVICH from Ohio. This is a good person who cares about the status of the United States and about this matter before us. I thank the Senator.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased that, after much too long a delay, the Senate will meet its constitutional responsibility to vote on an important nomination for the President's national security team.

I am referring to the nomination of Mr. John Bolton to be our next ambassador to the United Nations.

This position must be filled if the administration is to advance its foreign policy, which includes both the use of the United Nations to support our country's goals, as well as our goals to advance reform in a very difficult international organization that, to be frank, has earned the skepticism of a good many Americans, including many in my home State of Utah.

It would be a mistake, however, to suggest that this administration is anti-U.N. After all, during his first term, President Bush addressed the United Nations more times than any of his predecessors ever had in the same period, throughout the entire history of the United Nations.

That the President has regularly consulted with, and sought the support of, the United Nations gives lie to accusations that he is a unilateralist.

That he has never hinged our foreign policy needs and goals on the support of the United Nations demonstrates that our President has a proper understanding of our sovereign rights, as well as a realistic understanding of what the U.N. can contribute. The vast majority of the citizens of my State agree with President Bush that the U.N. can be sought as a useful tool to advance our national security, but that the pursuit of our foreign policy goals should never be conditioned on U.N. approval.

John Bolton, whose career in foreign policy has included numerous positions where he was worked with international organizations, including much experience with the U.N., understands this. Certainly it is not for lack of experience that Mr. Bolton's nomination has become so controversial. Nobody can credibly make that argument.

It is because of his philosophical convictions about the limits of international organizations—convictions shared by the President who nominated him—that Mr. Bolton's nomination has been delayed. I have found this entire spectacle to be dismaying.

Early objections were quite plain in this approach: John Bolton was charged with an unnecessarily skeptical view of multilateralism.

In my opinion, the reason George Bush won a decisive victory in a close re-election campaign is because the American public recognizes that national security issues are of dire importance, and that the President has a better grasp of how the real world works.

The vast majority of the Utahns I represent object to any suggestion of checking American power with multilateral institutions.

They do not believe in "aggressive multilateralism" an expression used during past administrations.

They do not believe that the reluctance of European powers to join us in all our causes is a failure of our diplomacy, because nations will pursue their national interest no matter what the rhetoric may be. To measure diplomacy by the decisions of nations is to

misunderstand both diplomacy and the dynamics of how nations pursue their national interest. President Bush understands this, as does John Bolton.

The nomination process grew quite tawdry, in my opinion, when it turned to innuendo and, in some cases, attacks on the nominee's character.

I know John Bolton. He is a decent, honorable man of inestimable intelligence who has done a tremendous job in every public position he has held.

Opponents of Mr. Bolton declared, insinuated, and denounced the nominee based on a handful of alleged reports of his cantankerousness. Imagine that. A cantankerous personality in a high-powered job. In Washington, no less. Give me a break.

Mr. President, the list of those who have stood up for Mr. Bolton is one of the most impressive I have ever seen in my years in the Senate. And I will leave it to my colleagues to attempt to include it all in the RECORD. I must note, however, the following statement included in a letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

We, the undersigned, have been appalled at the charges that have been leveled at John Bolton during the course of his nomination hearing to be this country's ambassador to the United Nations. Each of us has worked with Mr. Bolton. We know him to be a man of personal and intellectual integrity, deeply devoted to the service of this country and the promotion of our foreign policy interests as established by this President and the Congress. Not one of us has ever witnessed conduct on his part that resembles that which has been alleged. We feel our collective knowledge of him and what he stands for, combined with our own experiences in government and in the private sector, more than counterbalances the credibility of those who have tried to destroy the distinguished achievements of a lifetime.

This is a letter signed by former Attorney General Ed Meese, former Attorney General and Governor of Pennsylvania Dick Thornburgh, former Associate Attorney General and Governor of Oklahoma, Frank Keating, former Assistant Attorney General and Governor of Massachusetts, William Weld, and more than 30 of Mr. Bolton's former colleagues in the Department of Justice.

Following the ideological criticisms, following the attacks on his character, the opponents of Mr. Bolton tried the intelligence angle. Apparently, Mr. Bolton has disagreed with a few intelligence reports and analysts. His opponents appear to believe that by waving a specious charge of "misrepresenting intelligence," they can hit the theme of imperfect intelligence that serious policymakers have been wrestling with during the last few years of this administration. And we all know, and certainly we members of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence know, that intelligence has been seriously flawed in recent years. We all know that.

But to take a serious problem, which our committee has now spent years exposing and correcting, with the support of the administration—and to turn it

into an opportunistic attack on a nomination for the U.N. ambassador is specious at best. At no point in our investigations of intelligence regarding Iraq, have we found convincing evidence that intelligence analysts were pressured to change their views based as a result of political pressure. And none of our conclusions have indicated that the intelligence process would be made better if dissenting views would be suppressed. If anything, we need more dissent to qualify and verify our intelligence products.

If there is anything we have learned in our review of faulty intelligence, it is that there is not enough scrutiny, not enough skepticism and, frankly, not enough expressing contrasting views. Apparently, our friends on the other side, the Democrats, do not seem to understand this. I am relieved now that after all the delay, the President will get his vote on his nomination of this very fine man for this very important position.

I commend the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for his commitment and patience in bringing this nomination to the floor. I know how tough it is to sit through meeting after meeting where the nominee is being attacked with what really amount to almost flippant attacks. Both of Senator LUGAR's virtues—his commitment and patience—have been, I suspect, severely tested.

John Bolton served as a senior diplomat for this country in various capacities for over 20 years. He has served with great distinction and has many accomplishments to his credit. He has my personal admiration for these accomplishments. Whether they have been standing up to the United Nations and our country's rejection of that organization's intellectual disease, known as declaring Zionism as racism, or in his post-9/11 efforts to advance multilateral cooperation in his proliferation security initiative, Mr. Bolton's efforts have advanced U.S. interests and U.S. values. I am grateful for his work on behalf of our Nation, and I am grateful that he chooses to continue to serve.

In closing, I note a section of a letter sent to the Foreign Relations Committee by former Secretaries of State Baker, Eagleburger, Haig, Kissinger, and Shultz, and former Secretaries of Defense Carlucci and Schlesinger, former U.N. Ambassador Kirkpatrick, and other distinguished former national security officials:

Secretary Bolton, like the administration, has his critics, of course. Anyone as energetic and effective as John is bound to encounter those who disagree with some or even all of the administration's policies. But the policies for which he is sometimes criticized are those of the President and the Department of State which he has served with loyalty, honor, and distinction.

President Bush has the right to his nominee for the United Nations. All Senators have the right to refuse consent if they so choose. If our friends on the other side, or even friends on this

side, disagree with Mr. Bolton and want to vote "no," they have every right to do so. But he certainly deserves a vote up or down for this very important position, and he does not deserve to have his nomination filibustered.

All Senators, as I say, have a right to refuse consent. In a time of war—and we remain in a complicated global war—a President's right to assemble his national security team should not be hindered, and it certainly should not be hindered by people on the floor of the Senate. It is time, well past due, to have this vote.

Mr. Bolton is a good man. I have known him for most of those 20 years. I know him personally. I know he is a man of integrity. I know he is a man of great intelligence. I know he is a tough person, exactly what we Americans would like to have at the U.N., sometimes called a dysfunctional U.N. This is a man who can bring some credibility. This is a man who can straighten some of the mess out. This is a man who can make a difference. He has been confirmed so many times in the Senate, one would think we would be ashamed to make some of the arguments that have been made against this very fine man.

I will vote for Mr. Bolton, and if he is confirmed, I will offer him my continuing support as he undertakes yet another demanding mission, and it is demanding. I urge all my colleagues to be fair. That is what is involved here. It is a question of fairness. I hope they will be fair and vote for this very fine man and give our side a chance to have somebody there who is strong, tough, knowledgeable, loyal, and capable. He is all of those things. I can personally testify to that extent, knowing this man as I do. I hope everybody will vote for cloture today and then hopefully afterwards vote Mr. Bolton up so he can start serving and the President can have his foreign policy team in place.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Republican side for yielding me 10 minutes. So I yield myself 10 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the vote we will be casting at 6 o'clock today, the cloture vote. I had some opportunity to speak on the merits and demerits of the Bolton nomination yesterday and had an opportunity to discuss this issue with my colleague, Senator LUGAR, and others

who were on the Senate floor at the time.

Today, I rise to focus on what the vote that may take place at 6 o'clock today is about. We are about to vote on a genuine constitutional option. The vote we are about to cast on cloture, if it takes place, is about whether we are going to stand up for this coequal branch of Government's rights to review relevant information in the exercise of our constitutional responsibility and our constitutional power to advise and consent to nominations put forward by the President or whether we are going to let the executive branch define for us what information is necessary in the exercise of our constitutional responsibility.

The President has his constitutional responsibilities, defined in article II. We have our constitutional responsibilities, defined in article I. Our responsibility is to advise and consent as it relates to any nomination for an appointive office, above a certain level, that the President of the United States makes. It is the President's obligation to propose; it is our obligation to dispose of the nominee.

The State Department has denied the request completely, stating that to fulfill it would chill the deliberative process and that it "does not believe the requests to be specifically tied to issues being deliberated by the Committee."

The department's assertion about deliberative process is not trivial. That concern did not stop the Department and the CIA, however, from already turning over numerous materials to the committee that involve the very same type of deliberative process—preparation of speeches and testimony. And the department has made no effort to justify why it is drawing the line here.

The Department's second assertion—that the Syria material is not relevant to the committee's inquiry—is nothing less than an outrageous attempt by the executive branch to tell the Senate how it may exercise its constitutional power.

For several weeks, the Committee on Foreign Relations has been requesting two types of information which have been denied to it.

The first relates to preparation for testimony on Syria and weapons of mass destruction that Mr. Bolton was to give in 2003. The State Department has denied the request completely, stating that to fulfill it would chill the deliberative process and that it "does not believe the requests to be specifically tied to issues being deliberated by the Committee."

The Constitution says that the Senate shall advise and consent to nominations. The appointments clause does not limit the Senate's power to review nominations to those matters the executive branch deems relevant.

Our Founding Fathers designed a system of checks and balances, not a system of blank checks.

We must defend the Senate's constitutional powers, however, or we shall surely lose them.

The second type of information the committee has not received relates to Mr. Bolton's requests to obtain the identity of U.S. persons cited in NSA intercept reports. We are told that Mr. Bolton did this on 10 occasions, involving 19 U.S. person identities.

The chairman and vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee have been shown these intercepts, but Senator LUGAR and I have not.

Even Senators ROBERTS and ROCKEFELLER were not told the identities of the U.S. persons, moreover, information that was readily shared with Mr. Bolton and even with his staff.

No one in the executive branch has explained why an Under Secretary of State—and a staff member not holding any Senate-confirmed position—may see this information, but the chairman and ranking members of the relevant Senate oversight committees may not.

Senator ROBERTS tells us that after reviewing the contents of each report, it is apparent that it is:

not necessary to know the actual names [of the U.S. persons] to determine whether the requests were proper.

With all respect, I believe my friend has it wrong. Learning the actual names is the key to the inquiry—and it is impossible to make any judgment about the propriety of Mr. Bolton's requests without knowing the names.

I am inclined to think there is nothing improper in Mr. Bolton's requests for this NSA information.

But the longer the executive branch withholds this material, the more I start to wonder. If Mr. Bolton did nothing wrong, then why won't the administration let us confirm that?

Senator ROCKEFELLER reported to our committee yesterday that Mr. Bolton, upon learning from NSA the identity of a U.S. official who had delivered a message just the way that Bolton wanted it to be delivered, sought out that U.S. official and congratulated him. That action may have violated the restrictions that NSA imposes on further dissemination of its information.

More importantly, if Mr. Bolton used U.S. person identities in an NSA intercept to congratulate officials who did what he wanted, might he also have used such U.S. person identities to attack officials with whom he did not agree? That has been suggested in the press, and while I doubt that Mr. Bolton would do that, Senator ROCKEFELLER's report urges the Foreign Relations Committee to seek:

... a more complete understanding of the extent to which he may have shared with others the nineteen U.S. person identities he requested and received from the NSA.

All Members of the Senate should understand: both the integrity of the nomination process, and the Senate's constitutional role, are being challenged today.

The failure of the administration to cooperate with the committee, and one

of the rationales offered for this failure—that the:

Department does not believe these requests to be specifically tied to the issues being deliberated by the Committee

—has no constitutional justification.

The administration has asserted neither executive privilege nor any other constitutionally-based rationale for not cooperating with this committee.

It has no right under past practice or under constitutional theory to deny us information on a nomination based on its own belief that the request is not specifically tied to the issues being deliberated by the Committee.

Under the doctrine of separation of powers, the Senate is a co-equal branch of Government. It is within our power—and ours alone—to decide what we think is relevant to our deliberations in the exercise of the advice and consent power.

To acquiesce in the administration's remarkable assertion would undermine the Senate's power. If we vote on this nomination without getting all the facts first, that it is a step that we will all come to regret.

The request for this cloture vote is not a filibuster. If there were a filibuster, we would have demanded the use of 30 hours of debate time post-cloture.

This vote is a vote about the Senate's constitutional power. It is a vote to tell the executive branch it must turn over information the Senate has requested.

I urge my colleagues to reject cloture.

The Constitution, to paraphrase Hamilton in Federalist 76, is designed to make sure that nobody becomes an appointed official at the executive level, the Cabinet level, whom the President does not want. That is a guarantee. But it does not guarantee the President gets the first person he asks for, or the second person. It guarantees that the Senate will use due diligence in determining whether the person the President of the United States nominates to fill a position—in this case, ambassador to the United Nations—whether that appointment is in the interest of the United States of America.

That is our job. We are not filibustering. This is not about whether we will vote on Mr. Bolton's nomination. The Senator from Connecticut and I and others have said, we are ready to vote on Mr. Bolton's nomination, if you give us information that we have requested and are entitled to in assessing whether Mr. Bolton should go to the U.N. representing the United States of America.

The President has an option under the Constitution. He can say, Senate, what you are asking for is a violation of the separation of powers doctrine; you are not entitled to the information you seek because it falls into the purview of what we call executive privilege. In order for me as President—or for any President—to be able to con-

duct my job I must be able to have conversations with my key people that are wide ranging and open with the sure knowledge they will never get beyond this Oval Office; otherwise, the President couldn't do his job. That is what executive privilege is all about. As the Executive, I have the privilege to have confidential discussions with my subordinates. Or, the information you are seeking infringes upon the power of the executive in such a way that you are usurping article II powers, or attempting to yield them, like Estrada, to the third branch of Government in article III.

They do not assert any of that. They just say the information we have asked for, in their opinion, is not relevant to our legitimate inquiry. That is a new one for all the years I have been here.

I thank the majority leader of the Senate, Senator FRIST, for trying what I believe has been his level best to get the information. He and I had a call today. He has talked about this. I am sure I am not revealing anything I shouldn't. He contacted the National Security Agency. He said, Why can't we see the so-called intercepts we are talking about? Give me, the majority leader, the same information you gave to Mr. Bolton and his staff.

The majority leader was surprised when he was told by a general running the National Security Agency, No, I won't give you that. I will give you the same thing I gave to the Intelligence Committee which is a redacted document. That is a fancy phrase for saying, the document without the names.

I said, Mr. Leader, I think that is not good enough. I think he knows it is not good enough. This is strong-arming. They are making no argument as to why we are not entitled to it.

I remind Members, the information we are seeking is information Mr. Bolton's staff got. Mr. Bolton, as important as an under secretary is, is not the majority leader of the Senate; he is not the Senator from Connecticut. Mr. Bolton's staff got this information.

I asked the leader why they wouldn't release the information, and he said because it is highly secret. Translate that. Got that? They are not going to give information to the leader of the Senate because it is secret. In the neighborhood I come from, that means, you don't trust me. The nerve of this outfit to say they are not going to give the information.

With regard to Syria—and my time is about up—we have asked for information relating to whether Mr. Bolton was lying to us and whether Mr. Bolton was trying to get us into war with Syria in the summer of 2003 when a lot of people wanted to go to war.

Remember the argument? The argument was that all the weapons of mass destruction—that turned out never to have existed—were smuggled to Syria. Syria has them, plus a nuclear program, and we better do something about it. And what the intelligence community said to Mr. Bolton was, you

cannot say that—or whatever it was that he proposed to say. The facts do not sustain it. He pushed and pushed and pushed. But he told the Foreign Relations Committee he had nothing to do with that draft testimony, he was not pushing.

All we want to see is the draft texts of the speech and the material on the clearance process. I hope the Senate will stand up for itself today at 6 o'clock.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as if in morning business.

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, before I make the remarks, let me reaffirm my commitment and my support for John Bolton as ambassador to the United Nations.

Like every Member of this Senate, I recognize the importance of that appointment. I recognize the concerns many of my constituents in Georgia have had with the United Nations. John Bolton is the right man at the right time for this country to be our ambassador to the United Nations.

(The remarks of Mr. ISAKSON are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, once again, I come to the floor to voice my concerns regarding the appointment of John Bolton to an important office in this administration. This time he is being promoted to a Government position with high international profile, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. I believe his appointment to this post will harm our interests at the UN and hamstring our international cooperation efforts.

Mr. Bolton, whom I opposed when he was nominated to be the Under Secretary for Arms Control, did not distinguish himself in his last job. His comments about the North Korean regime during sensitive negotiations almost derailed our efforts there. This is not just my opinion. After his remarks, Mr. Bolton's superiors recalled him to the United States and sent a replacement. This blunder is not the only black mark on Mr. Bolton's record. He also failed in another highly critical negotiation—our unsuccessful attempts to convince Iran to curtail its nuclear activities.

Mr. Bolton also has publicly and often expressed his disdain for the United Nations—the very institution the President has chosen to send him presumably to represent us and pursue our interests. How can he do that when his public criticism of the U.N. has been, not constructive or thoughtful, but heavy handed and destructive? He has advocated not paying our U.N. dues and, in a moment of high arrogance, said he thought there should only be one permanent member of the Security Council—the United States—to reflect today's international power structure. Statements like these make our allies believe that we do not value their cooperation and effort—and perhaps Mr.

Bolton does not. His remarks create ill will and make it harder for us to lead in the international community—and perhaps Mr. Bolton believes the United States needs to play no role in that community. He has a right to those views. But we in the Senate have a right not to consent to the appointment to the ambassador to the U.N. of a man whose views would, in my opinion, keep him from being able to do his job.

There is an old saying that “you gather more flies with honey, than with vinegar”. I am afraid that we are sending a big bottle of vinegar to the U.N., and it will attract us no friends. Diplomacy requires tact. It requires being able to use both the carrot and the stick, rewards and sanctions. Mr. Bolton seems to be focused entirely on the stick, believing that by wielding our power and the threat of force like a cudgel, we can bring the international community into line. I do not agree.

Senator VOINOVICH was right when he said the United States can do better than John Bolton. There are so many bright, gifted people in the administration that would do a better job and be a better fit. I regret the President did not send one of those people to us for this high profile job. Mr. Bolton's presence at the U.N. will do little to build our prestige around the world, and may well hamstring our efforts in the war on terror. I urge my colleagues to vote against this nominee.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the nomination of John Bolton to be the United States Representative to the United Nations.

I have three criteria I use to evaluate all executive branch nominees: competence, integrity, and commitment to the core mission of the department.

Mr. Bolton has had wide-ranging experience and is competent.

I do not agree with many of Mr. Bolton's past statements about the U.N. However, his statements during the confirmation process indicate he is now committed to the mission of the U.N. I will give him the benefit of the doubt on this one.

But I cannot be so flexible when it comes to the very serious questions about Mr. Bolton's integrity.

I rise today as the Senator from Maryland and as a long-time member of the Senate Intelligence Committee. I have been working on reforming our intelligence community since I first became a member of the Intelligence Committee before the tragedy of September 11. I served on the 2002 joint inquiry about what happened on that terrible day. I served on the Intelligence Committee's 2003 review of Iraq intelligence.

I worked on the 2004 reform legislation that built on the work of the 9/11 Commission and that we passed last year. We looked for ways to prevent what happened on September 11 from ever happening again. We looked for ways to make sure that what happened

with Iraq—where we thought there were weapons that weren't there—will never happen again. We looked for ways to get the right information to policy makers.

Throughout all that work over the years, I have kept the many talented, hard working, dedicated, and patriotic Americans working throughout the world for our intelligence agencies foremost in my mind. One of my central concerns has been to try to ensure that they have the right and ability to do their jobs: to get the facts and speak truth to power.

Speaking truth to power means telling the boss what he or she should hear rather than just what they want to hear. This is absolutely critical to the security of our Nation. That is why I am opposing John Bolton's nomination to be America's Representative to the United Nations. It is clear to me that he does not respect the truth or the hard working experts that labor day in and day out to provide policy makers with the best information and their best judgments.

I have carefully reviewed the report prepared by the Foreign Relations Committee. It is evident to me, from reading the minority views of the committee's report, that Mr. Bolton is a bully, but not just any bully. He is a bully with a purpose: to browbeat intelligence professionals to disregard the facts, and to send a message to all the other intelligence professionals that they speak the truth at their peril. His purpose seems clear: to intimidate. His actions seem clear: to retaliate.

Mr. Bolton retaliated against those who disagreed with him. He claims not to have sought to have anyone fired. He said he merely “lost confidence” in them. But, that's just a polite way to say a person is unqualified and should be fired. It's a distinction without a difference. When a senior policy maker has lost confidence in you, I think we can all agree that your career is effectively over.

Playing with words cannot obscure the fact that Mr. Bolton went after intelligence professionals for doing their jobs, for telling the truth, for speaking truth to power. He was the power, the boss, the senior official and he had no use for truth.

According to the investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Bolton tried to fire an analyst with the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research. The intelligence professional disagreed about language regarding biological weapons that Mr. Bolton wanted to include in a speech. Mr. Bolton also asked that the National Intelligence Officer for Latin America be reassigned, because he told Mr. Bolton that the language on biological weapons did not reflect the intelligence community's assessment.

Mr. Bolton also appears to have abused his access to intelligence. The Senate Intelligence Committee recently investigated charges that Mr.

Bolton shared classified information that he received from the NSA. The minority view of that investigation concluded that Mr. Bolton did share classified information, after being specifically instructed by NSA not to do so. Even more troubling, it appears that the reason Mr. Bolton gave the NSA to justify his “need to know” was not the real reason he sought out the information.

This is yet another example of John Bolton using and misusing intelligence to suit his own purposes. It is also clear that Mr. Bolton bullied a number of others who dared to disagree with him, including others in the intelligence community. My colleagues—Senator BIDEN, Senator VOINOVICH and others—have detailed these charges well, and I will not repeat that here.

Mr. Bolton's intolerant attitude and conduct must not be rewarded. It inevitably results in chilling truth and facts. It is an attitude hostile to the very concept of speaking truth to power.

We need the world to understand that the United States getting Iraq wrong was an aberration, a one-time, never-to-be-repeated mistake. The world must believe, and it must be true, that facts and truth are what inform our policies and actions at home and abroad.

They must also believe our leaders and policy makers when they speak. When we speak about intelligence, people cannot be wondering, is that American lying to me, misleading me, telling me half the truth.

The stakes are too high: war and peace; life and death; weapons of mass destruction; Iran; North Korea; terrorism. These are the stakes we are talking about.

America cannot afford to send someone to the U.N. that many people already believe does not respect the truth. We already have a huge credibility gap at the U.N. and in the world.

The U.N. was where our respected Secretary of State laid out our case for going to war with Iraq. We disclosed extensive intelligence information to demonstrate that Iraq had WMD, that it was a threat to the region, our country and the world. We now know, through no fault of our Secretary of State, that much of that information was wrong.

Many of us have worked tirelessly to make sure that something like that never happens again. Building on the work of the 9/11 Commission, we worked for much of last year to pass dramatic and broad based reform of our intelligence community. We fought hard to make sure that a single person would be in charge of the entire intelligence community, to mandate alternative or red team analysis to always make sure that we policymakers have the best information available.

We are now working to make that reform a reality. Just last month, I voted with 97 of my colleagues to confirm the

country's first Director of National Intelligence and his deputy. We have done much, but there is much to do.

We are building a new foundation for our entire intelligence community. It is a work in progress. Every step is important.

But one of the most important steps is ensuring that our intelligence professionals understand and believe that their work is valued. That truth and facts are important. That they can and must speak truth to power. That we are on their side. That the Senate of the United States takes these matters seriously.

That is why at the confirmation hearing of our nation's first nominee for Director of National Intelligence, I asked Mr. Negroponte if he agreed that the professionals in the intelligence community must be free to "speak truth to power." He said, "Truth to power is crucial. And we've got to assure the objectivity and integrity of our intelligence analysts."

I also asked him if he will create a tone where there will be no retaliation for people who attempt to speak the truth. Mr. Negroponte said, "Yes. I think the short answer to you is a categorical yes."

I asked those questions of the nominee, who was under oath and at an open hearing, for two very important reasons.

First, I wanted the world to hear what he had to say.

Second, I wanted all of our intelligence professionals throughout the World to hear what he had to say.

I wanted our intelligence professionals to know that they were authorized, indeed, obligated to seek the truth and speak the truth. And, I wanted them to know that our most senior intelligence professional, the Director of National Intelligence, would not tolerate retaliation for speaking truth to power. Mr. Negroponte's statements stand on their own.

I believe it would be wrong to confirm Mr. Bolton as the United States representative to the United Nations. He has disregarded the truth. He has sought to punish intelligence professionals for speaking the truth. He has tried to intimidate intelligence professionals into agreeing with him regardless of the facts.

To confirm Mr. Bolton would send a terrible message to our intelligence professionals. It would be a terrible signal for our intelligence reform efforts. It would undermine our efforts to restore our credibility in the world and to do the hard work of reforming the United Nations.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have been privileged to have served under both President Clinton and President George W. Bush as one of the two Senate delegates to the United Nations, and there is no doubt that the United States Permanent Representative to the U.N. is one of the most important diplomatic posts in the U.S. government.

The Permanent Representative is the public face, voice, and vote of the United States at the world's only body charged with maintaining international peace and security. Therefore, it is essential that this individual be someone with indisputable integrity and extraordinary diplomatic abilities. After listening to John Bolton's confirmation hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I feel confident in saying that John Bolton is not that person.

Most troubling to me are allegations from senior U.S. intelligence officials—including a senior Bush administration appointee—of Mr. Bolton trying to intimidate and even remove intelligence analysts simply because they did not share his political views. Mr. Bolton even went so far as to get in his car and go out to the CIA to seek the removal of one intelligence officer. At any time, but especially in the wake of the massive intelligence failures associated with the decision to invade Iraq, efforts by administration officials to shape intelligence to conform to a particular preconceived view is unacceptable. It is essential that dissent be tolerated and even encouraged in the intelligence community and not distorted to fit a particular ideology or political agenda.

Second, I have strong concerns that Mr. Bolton's pattern of inflammatory statements about the U.N. will make it difficult for him to effectively advance U.S. security interests in New York and to build support for much-needed reforms at the U.N. The last thing we want is for countries to make Mr. Bolton an excuse for resisting reform. Taking a tougher approach to the U.N. through constructive criticism is one thing; disregarding its value and belittling its very existence is another. We need someone in New York who is unafraid to shake things up and challenge the status quo, but that person must also have the credibility, temperament, and diplomatic skills to work with other nations, form coalitions, and advance U.S. interests. The only tool in Mr. Bolton's toolbox appears to be a hammer.

Third, I am disturbed by some of the contradictions in Mr. Bolton's recent testimony. For example, Mr. Bolton pledged to the Foreign Relations Committee that he has not and will not make statements that are not approved by the administration. Yet his own testimony about Iran appeared to do just that—using language rejected by the administration more than a year ago. There are other instances of this behavior during the hearings, where our Ambassador to South Korea has disputed what Mr. Bolton said.

Finally, there is a tone and temperament issue with Mr. Bolton's nomination. According to respected officials who have worked with him, Mr. Bolton bullies, belittles and undermines those who do not agree with him. We all lose our cool from time to time. Disagreements are part of human discourse. But, there is a pattern with Mr. Bolton

that goes beyond appropriate behavior—a disturbing trait for someone seeking to become our chief diplomat at a place where people come together to resolve disagreements.

When Mr. Bolton was nominated to be Under Secretary of State in 2001, I strongly opposed and voted against his nomination. At that time, I had serious reservations about his experience, diplomatic temperament, and his poor track record on non-proliferation and arms control. Over the last four years, Mr. Bolton has proved me right. As the top proliferation official at the State Department, Mr. Bolton has been ineffective in his current responsibilities and the world has become more dangerous under his watch. The Bush administration's record on proliferation, from Pakistan to Iran to North Korea, has been poor, at best.

After much debate, the Foreign Relations Committee was not able to support Mr. Bolton's nomination and, rather, reported it out without recommendation. Secretary Powell's Chief of Staff has said that Mr. Bolton would be an "abysmal" ambassador to the U.N. I might not put it as strongly as that, but I will be opposing the nomination of Mr. Bolton.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my opposition to the nomination of John Bolton to be the next United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

Simply put, he is the wrong man at the wrong time for what is an important and critical position.

At a time when the reputation of the United States is at an all time low in many parts of the world and our military is stretched thin, we need a representative at the United Nations who can engage and work with our friends and allies to forge multilateral solutions on: the war on terror, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, global poverty, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, and global warming, just to name a few.

Yet throughout his career, John Bolton has demonstrated an unrestrained contempt for diplomacy and international treaties.

In a letter to Senator RICHARD LUGAR, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, 102 former American diplomats representing both Democratic and Republican administrations urged the committee to reject Mr. Bolton's nomination because of his "exceptional record of opposition to efforts to enhance U.S. security through arms control. The letter notes that Mr. Bolton led the effort against ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; blocked a more robust international agreement to curb the proliferation of small arms; led the effort to block the Ottawa Landmine Treaty; led the effort to have the United States withdraw from negotiations to formulate a verification system for the Biological Weapons Convention; and led the campaign to have the U.S. withdraw from the ABM Treaty.

What sort of message do we send to our friends and allies by nominating an ideologue and not a consensus builder for this leading post at the United Nations?

I, for one, am unaware of another nominee to an international body who has garnered so much opposition from individuals who have served on the front lines of American diplomacy.

The fact is, these 102 U.S. diplomats who have written in strenuous opposition to Mr. Bolton recognize that dialogue, cooperation, and, yes, compromise are essential if we are to build alliances and enlist the support of other states in tackling the common problems we all face.

By opposing virtually every meaningful arms control treaty over the past few years, John Bolton has placed his faith in a unilateral, go-it-alone foreign policy that has stretched our military thin and dramatically weakened respect for America in the world.

I had hoped that President Bush would make the rebuilding of our friendships and alliances a priority for the next four years. The nomination of Mr. Bolton sends precisely a different signal that the U.N. will continue to be our rhetorical whipping boy.

We all know that we cannot afford to go it alone in taking on the great challenges in front of us. It is faulty to assume that once he arrives at the United Nations headquarters in New York, John Bolton will suddenly discover a new faith in diplomacy and international agreements.

It is also a stretch to assume that John Bolton will likewise discover a newfound faith in the United Nations and its mission. Many of Mr. Bolton's comments about the United Nations have been raised before but they are worth repeating. Such as:

There is no such thing as the United Nations. There is an international community that occasionally can be led by the only real power left in the world and that is the United States when it suits our interest and we can get others to go along.

The secretariat building in New York has 38 stories. If you lost ten stories today it wouldn't make a bit of difference.

If I were redoing the Security Council today, I'd have one permanent member because that's the real reflection of the distribution of power in the world . . . the United States.

As my friend and colleague Senator BIDEN has stated, when you listen to quotes such as these, you wonder why Mr. Bolton would even want the job of Ambassador to the United Nations.

Indeed, given his disdain for the institution and the other members of the Security Council, Mr. Bolton is unlikely to find a receptive audience for his ideas and initiatives, much less be able to forge alliances to protect American interests and increase global security.

How successful is Mr. Bolton likely to be in enlisting United Nations support for promoting political stability and economic development in Iraq and Afghanistan; stopping the genocide in

Darfur; convincing North Korea and Iran to forgo their respective nuclear weapons programs; combating the global HIV/AIDS pandemic; stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and fighting the war on terror?

To say the least, I have little confidence in Mr. Bolton's chances for success if he is confirmed and his inability to be an effective and constructive ambassador will produce disastrous consequences for American foreign policy.

In response to the mounting criticism of the President's nomination, the administration has attempted to shift the debate from Mr. Bolton's qualifications to the need for reform of the United Nations.

A vote for Mr. Bolton is a vote for reform at the U.N., they argue. A vote against Mr. Bolton is a vote for the status quo. A blunt, no-nonsense approach is needed to get the job done.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Bolton has made it clear that he does not have faith in multilateral diplomacy or the mission of the United Nations. Why should we expect him to be committed to a more effective United Nations? How effective is a blunt manner if the individual is unprepared to listen or compromise?

United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan has produced a report on recommendations for reforming the U.N. so that it can better tackle the challenges of the new century. The United States should play a meaningful and constructive role in that debate.

But his inflexible views and harsh temperament suggest to me that Mr. Bolton will himself be the issue at the U.N.—not the steps that need to be taken to improve the workings of the institution.

Let me turn now to several allegations have been made about Mr. Bolton's past conduct as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security that raise serious questions about his fitness to serve as United States ambassador to the United Nations.

As detailed in the minority report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on his nomination, Mr. Bolton sought to replace two intelligence analysts, Christian Westermann, a State Department analyst in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, and the National Intelligence Officer, NIO, for Latin America at the Central Intelligence Agency, who refused to back his assertion that Cuba was developing a biological weapons program; exaggerated intelligence on Cuba's biological weapons program and Syria's nuclear activities to fit his own personal views; and pushed for the dismissal of a State Department official he wrongly accused of purposefully withholding a document.

Supporters of Mr. Bolton's nomination argue that these charges should fall by the wayside because no one lost their job and his statements largely reflected the views of the intelligence community.

Even if you assume that this is true, Mr. Bolton's efforts to trash intelligence analysts and pattern intelligence to fit his views, had a chilling effect on the intelligence community and its ability to provide sound, credible intelligence.

Robert Hutchings, the former Chairman of the National Intelligence Council, told the Foreign Relations Committee:

[W]hen policy officials come back repeatedly to push the same kinds of judgments, and push the Intelligence Community to confirm a particular set of judgments, it does have the effect of politicizing intelligence, because the so called 'correct answer' becomes all too clear . . . it creates a climate of intimidation and a culture of conformity that is damaging.

Given the failure of pre-war intelligence on Iraq and the profound negative impact that failure had on the credibility of the United States in the international community, we should not send a representative to the United Nations who has sought to conform intelligence to his stated views and punish those who disagreed with him.

Indeed, the next United States Ambassador to the United Nations may very well be charged with gathering international support to convince Iran and North Korea to abandon their nuclear weapons programs. A person of Mr. Bolton's credibility on intelligence matters is unlikely to garner much support and, indeed will likely face stiffer opposition.

Surely the President can find another nominee who is committed to multilateral diplomacy and appreciates, rather than denigrates, the goals and mission of the United Nations.

Despite what the administration may assert about Mr. Bolton's "blunt" manner, such an individual will be far more effective at representing United States interests, shaping alliances to confront problems that transcend borders, and encouraging U.N. reform.

Mr. Bolton has made a career out of shunning diplomacy, blasting the United Nations, ignoring the advice of others, and moving ahead with a foreign policy that emphasizes arrogance over leadership.

In these difficult times, he is a risk, not an asset, in advancing our national security interests abroad and on that basis does not deserve the Senate's support in confirming his nomination.

Mr. CORZINE, Mr. President, today I will be voting against the nomination of John Bolton to be Ambassador to the United Nations.

When the President first nominated Mr. Bolton for this position, I expressed deep disappointment and concern. First, because of his repeated expression of disdain for the organization. But, more importantly, because Mr. Bolton is as responsible as any member of the administration for the needless confrontations with the rest of the world and for the international isolation that plagued President Bush's first term and for the shaky credibility

we carry today. At a time when we need to be strengthening our alliances and making full use of international institutions to achieve our foreign policy goals, sending Mr. Bolton to the United Nations sends the exact wrong message. I don't accept his view that the U.N. is a vehicle to be used by the U.S. "when it suits our interests and we can get others to go along." Diplomacy in most people's minds requires attention to more than just coalitions of the willing.

Over the past month, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has uncovered a pattern of behavior on the part of Mr. Bolton that has only confirmed my concerns. Most disturbing to me is the evidence of Mr. Bolton's troubled and confrontational relationship with our intelligence community.

In speeches and testimony, he has appeared to stretch the available intelligence to fit his preconceived views. On three separate occasions, he tried to inflate language characterizing our intelligence assessments regarding Syria's nuclear activities. He sought to exaggerate the intelligence community's views about Cuba's possible biological weapons activities. His track record, on these and other matters, was so bad that the Deputy Secretary of State made an extraordinary order—that Mr. Bolton could not give any testimony or speech that was not personally cleared by the Deputy Secretary or the Secretary's Chief of Staff.

He also dampened critical debates among professionals on important policy issues by retaliating against analysts who presented a different point of view than his own. For example, on three occasions over a six month period, he sought to remove a mid-level analyst who disputed the language he tried to use about Cuba.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is a serious matter. I would not criticize Mr. Bolton for asking intelligence analysts hard questions about proliferation issues, nor should policy makers refrain from challenging the assumptions of those analysts. But Mr. Bolton was doing something far different. He made it clear that he expected intelligence analyses that conformed with his preconceived policy views. Rather than welcome contrary intelligence analyses as essential to an informed debate, he retaliated against those who offered contrary views.

Mr. Bolton's approach to those around him has been harshly criticized by those who have worked with him. Larry Wilkerson, the Chief of Staff for Secretary Powell, called him a "lousy leader." Carl Ford, former head of the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, referred to Mr. Bolton as a "quintessential kiss-up, kick-down sort of guy."

This is not the person we need at the United Nations. Good diplomacy, like good business, relies on a great team and a good leader. Good leaders listen. They listen to their troops, they make reasoned decisions, they take responsi-

bility, and they build the respect and loyalty of their staff. Management by fear is a recipe, in both public service and the private sector, for getting only the information that you want to hear. Shoot the messenger and other messengers will not volunteer to deliver the bad news. And I submit to you that Mr. Bolton has developed a reputation for shooting the messenger.

We must begin to learn the lessons of Iraq. It should be more than clear by now that our national interests are damaged when policy makers bend intelligence. And we should all understand by now that accurate, objective intelligence requires analysts who are free to offer differing views. We face serious threats, from international terrorism to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We have serious foreign policy concerns to address, from genocide to global climate change. Protecting our national security interests demands policy makers who seek objective intelligence on these and other challenges. Given his track record, John Bolton is clearly not that policy maker.

Another lesson of Iraq is the critical importance of American credibility. The inaccurate presentations made by our Government to the international community have done serious damage to our interests. If we are to gain the active support of other nations in confronting common threats such as terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, we will need to convince those nations of our views. To do so, we will need their trust. This challenge is especially complicated at the United Nations, where Secretary of State Colin Powell gave what turned out to be an almost entirely inaccurate presentation on Iraq, and where the administration dismissed all alternative views, including those of U.N. inspectors. Mr. Bolton is not the person to repair this damage. And his record makes it extremely unlikely that he could rebuild our credibility in the international community in its most visible forum—the U.N.

The nomination of John Bolton is a lost opportunity for this administration to regain American leadership at the United Nations. It is also dangerous. Failure to gain support in the U.N. for our policies puts us at unnecessary risk. Simply put, we cannot afford an ineffective Ambassador at the United Nations.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, before the people of New Jersey elected me to the Senate 23 years ago, I worked in the corporate world.

I helped start a company from scratch, and when I left, we had about 20 thousand employees.

I learned a few things about hiring people.

I learned that a person might be an intelligent human being. They might be proficient at many things. They might have a lot of interesting ideas.

But if they don't fit the description for the position you need to fill, they are not the right person for the job.

If you need a carpenter, you don't hire someone who can't use a hammer, even if they know a lot about houses.

If you need help with your taxes, you hire an accountant, not a music teacher.

And if you need someone to represent the United States to the other countries of the world, you hire a diplomat, not an ideologue.

We are talking about the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

This is not an entry level position. This job calls for an experienced diplomat.

What does that entail? Webster's Dictionary defines "diplomacy" as: the art and practice of conducting negotiations between nations for the attainment of mutually satisfactory terms; the procedures, methods and forms employed in conducting such negotiations; the skillful or successful settlement of differences between peoples; and, adroitness or artfulness in securing advantages without arousing hostility.

That definition does not sound like the Mr. Bolton we have heard about.

If we send Mr. Bolton to the United Nations, we would be sending a go-it-alone ideologue with open disdain for the U.N., exactly what our country does not need.

Around the world today, polls show that even citizens of our strongest allies have a generally unfavorable view of the United States.

I realize that many Americans say, "why should we care what other nations think?"

And the answer is, the attitudes of other nations affect our national security.

We recently celebrated VE Day. It was a day I will never forget, because I was serving in the Army in Europe. I celebrated the end of the war with my Army buddies, as well as British soldiers who were our allies.

As much as we might like to think that we don't need anything from any other country, it certainly was good to have allies in World War II.

And wouldn't it be good today if more nations would send troops to Iraq, so some of our soldiers could come home, and so American taxpayers wouldn't have to bear most of the cost of that war?

Whether we like it or not, world opinion matters.

The fact is, none of the major challenges our Nation faces today can be conquered by us alone.

In order to win the war on terror, curb global warming or succeed in the international economy, we need our allies and international institutions.

Failing to engage these indispensable partners will make U.S. efforts less effective, and jeopardize the stability, security, prosperity, and health of Americans.

John Bolton is the wrong man to forge the alliances we need to address these vital challenges.

Instead of reaching out to the rest of the world, his nomination would push

other nations away and isolate America.

Yesterday my friend from Indiana complained that we were putting Mr. Bolton's career "under a microscope."

Well, when I was in the private sector and my company was evaluating a potential new hire for a key position, that's exactly what we did—and I don't think there's anything wrong with it.

Mr. Bolton's track record at the State Department does not withstand close scrutiny.

As Undersecretary at State, he did nothing to resolve the potentially explosive situations in North Korea and Iran. Instead, he inflamed them.

He has blocked international arrangements including treaties limiting nuclear weapons testing, landmines, child soldiers, missile defense, and small arms trade.

He dismantled the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, and blocked a verification clause to the bio-weapons treaty.

And he was a leading opponent against the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Mr. Bolton does not have the credibility or the diplomatic skill to represent U.S. interests globally.

A smart businessman not only considers the work experience of a potential employee—you also look at his character and ability to get along with other people.

In this regard, Mr. Bolton also falls short.

For example, in 2002, he sought to exaggerate assessments of Syria's nuclear weapons capability and Cuba's biological weapons activities and support for terrorism beyond what U.S. intelligence believed to be true.

Dr. Robert Hutchings, former chair of the National Intelligence Council, described Mr. Bolton's efforts as "cherry-picking of little factoids and little isolated bits that were drawn out to present the starkest possible case."

Mr. Bolton bullied and tried to remove analysts whose work did not reflect his own biases.

As if all this were not enough, it appears now that Mr. Bolton was not truthful in his testimony before our Foreign Relations Committee on April 11.

Among John Bolton's misstatements: He said he did not try to get a State Department employee fired. He said he did not threaten any employees because of their views. He said he did not act against those officials because of differing views. He said the U.S. Ambassador to South Korea approved of his July 2003 speech, when we now in fact know that Ambassador Hubbard got in touch with the Foreign Relations Committee to "correct the record."

Just this month, 102 retired diplomats signed a letter to Senators LUGAR and BIDEN urging the Senate to reject the nomination of John Bolton to be our Nation's Ambassador to the United Nations.

These former diplomats have served in both Democratic and Republican ad-

ministrations. They all agree that John Bolton is the wrong man for the job.

I have heard Mr. Bolton compared to one of our former colleagues, my good friend and neighbor, Senator Pat Moynihan.

That is nonsense. Mr. Moynihan was not afraid to criticize the status quo, but as his daughter pointed out in a recent newspaper column, he appreciated the importance of the United Nations.

Pat Moynihan would never say, as John Bolton said, that, "if the United Nations lost 10 stories it wouldn't make a bit of difference."

This is an important position. We owe it to our country to fill it with the best person available. As my friend the Senator from Ohio said yesterday, "The United States can do better than John Bolton."

Mr. President, not only can we do better, for the good of the country, we must.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I speak today on the nomination of John Bolton to be the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. I want to express my full support for his confirmation.

Despite the criticisms of some of my colleagues across the aisle, John Bolton is without a doubt one the most qualified people to fill this position. I believe his no-nonsense diplomacy will be a welcome change at the U.N., and one that will prove to be effective in the future.

Now more than ever, the United Nations is in need of drastic reform. As the world's only super power and one of the original founders of the organization, it is the United States' responsibility to play leading role in this reform. Mr. Bolton's nomination is a reflection of this commitment. His pursuit for the truth will serve him well in holding the United Nations accountable for its past mistakes.

Although he is not a career diplomat, Mr. Bolton has a strong record of success within the international community. He has played pivotal roles in the signing of the treaty of Moscow, the repeal of the U.N. General Assembly's 1975 resolution that equated Zionism with racism, and the negotiations in the G-8 Partnership Against the Proliferation of WMD to name a few.

Mr. Bolton not only possesses the tenacity to deal with the U.N. but also has experience dealing with the organization on a first-hand basis. He voluntarily, I repeat voluntarily, worked for the U.N. between 1997 and 2000 with former Secretary of State James Baker on resolving the conflict in the Western Sahara. Not only did he play an integral role in creating a viable "peace plan" for the area, but did so on his own time.

Mr. President, this flies directly in the face of my colleagues across the aisle, who repeatedly accuse Mr. Bolton of hating the U.N. and wanting to dismantle the organization permanently. Rather than being committed to the organization's demise, I believe he is

more committed to making it stronger and more effective.

I find myself deeply saddened by the efforts of a minority of Senators to delay Mr. Bolton's confirmation. He is an extremely qualified candidate, who has been confirmed by the Senate four times in the past. Why the change of heart now?

Rather than questioning Mr. Bolton's qualifications for the position and the need for U.N. reform, a minority of Senators are engaging themselves in what boils down to character assassination. I challenge my colleagues to look at Mr. Bolton's real character. He is a man of integrity and honesty, whose candid personality will serve him well at the United Nations.

I am confident the Senate will confirm Mr. Bolton. I wish him well in his new position and with the daunting task of reforming the United Nations. It is not an easy one. Despite this challenge, I believe he will be a welcome addition to the organization and an agent of change in the international community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have time reserved at 5:30, but I will make a comment before that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure to work with my good friend, John Bolton, on several issues. Each time I have worked with him, he has proven to be helpful and driven to obtain the results that will best serve the interests of the United States. He is a straight shooter, a no-nonsense type of guy who knows how to get results.

As most of my colleagues know, I take a special interest in issues regarding Asia. Alaska's past, present, and future have always looked westward to Russia, China, Japan, and the Korean Peninsula. It is for that reason that I have decided to support John Bolton.

North Korea has had nuclear aspirations many years and has taken aggressive steps to acquire nuclear weapons years before the Bush administration came into office.

John Bolton's straight-forward talk on North Korea should be applauded. He was telling the truth.

The United States made the good-faith effort with the 1994 Agreed Framework by providing food and support for building of the reactor. But this agreement was destined to fail because of North Korea's treacherous actions in the region. This is not a country we can trust. We now know that North Korea began cheating on it almost as the ink was drying by embarking on a covert uranium enrichment program.

The Bush administration has accomplished the core prerequisite for a lasting solution. It has galvanized the international community to work together on a lasting, multinational solution to the problem. The White House

has stated that the next venue for this discussion will be the United Nations.

John Bolton will be that voice, a compelling one, to ensure we are able to have an agreement that will stick. John Bolton is the strong voice that is required to ensure that America's vision on a nuclear weapon free North Korea is heard at the United Nations.

John Bolton believes in frank and honest diplomacy. John Bolton has not shied away from naming rogue states that violate international commitments such as the Biological Weapons Convention, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

He has had an effective working relationship with foreign governments, international institutions, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector for over three decades.

There is no question that John Bolton is qualified for the position of U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., and here are just a few reasons why:

As the Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, John Bolton led the efforts to implement the President's strong non-proliferation agenda, including reform of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

He has actively promoted effective multilateral solutions to real-world problems such as the proposal to create a Special Committee of the International Atomic Energy Agency Board to focus on safeguards and verification of nuclear programs.

John Bolton helped to bring about new leadership to improve the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

He was the President's point person in designing the Proliferation Security Initiative. Over 60 nations are now working together to share intelligence and are taking action to stop the transfer of dangerous weapons. The Proliferation Security Initiative was instrumental in getting Libya to make the strategic decision to abandon its WMD programs.

The U.N. is in need of reform. John Bolton supports reform at the United Nations so it is accountable, transparent, and effective. While serving as the Assistant Secretary for International Organizations, he detailed his concept of a "Unitary U.N." that sought to ensure management and budget reforms across the U.N. system. John Bolton will work with member states and the Congress to reform the U.N.

Allegations that Bolton manipulated intelligence are unfounded. As a policymaker, he asserted his view on intelligence. That was his job. Policymakers should question information extensively before accepting it as fact. These were internal policy debates, which occur in all Departments and agencies.

He may have disagreed with intelligence findings at times, but John Bolton always accepted the final judgments of the intelligence community.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the nomination of Undersecretary of State John Bolton as United States Ambassador to the United Nations, an institution which he has openly and repeatedly disdained.

A number of factors have led me to this decision, but they fall into several broad categories: Mr. Bolton's apparent abuse of the intelligence process and of his subordinates; his opposition to peacekeeping and other fundamental functions of the United Nations; his disdain for the institution itself; his opposition to important nonproliferation efforts; and the poor judgment he has displayed on key foreign policy questions.

Furthermore, there is the nomination process itself as it has been carried out in this case. Despite repeated requests from the Foreign Relations Committee, the executive branch did not provide key documents concerning Mr. Bolton's requests to learn the identities of 10 U.S. officials who were cited in intelligence intercepts.

The administration's failure to provide requested and relevant documents distorts the nomination process.

Although handicapped by a lack of information and candor, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee examined the charges that Undersecretary of State Bolton abused the intelligence process by seeking to have those who dared to dissent removed.

The evidence demonstrated a clear pattern of conduct that led 9 out of 18 members of that committee to vote against confirmation.

The minority views of the committee report on the Bolton nomination reached four firm conclusions on this matter:

One, Mr. Bolton repeatedly sought the removal of intelligence analysts who disagreed with him.

Two, in preparing speeches and testimony, Mr. Bolton repeatedly tried to stretch intelligence to fit his views.

Three, in his relations with colleagues and subordinates, Mr. Bolton repeatedly exhibited abusive behavior and intolerance for different views.

Four, Mr. Bolton repeatedly made misleading, disingenuous, or non-responsive statements to the committee.

We have to examine these conclusions in terms of the position for which Mr. Bolton is now being considered as the United States voice at the United Nations.

In his approach to intelligence, Mr. Bolton clearly sought to stretch the analysis to meet his world view rather than stretching his world view to accommodate other possibilities.

This is an extremely dangerous way to look at the world, as the 9/11 Commission and others have shown us.

Even more damaging, Mr. Bolton apparently used his position to attempt to intimidate subordinates and even to have analysts fired who dared to disagree, on such critical issues as the alleged development of weapons of mass destruction in Cuba and elsewhere.

Crying wolf about weapons of mass destruction is an extremely dangerous habit. The United States will be living with the consequences of poor intelligence and unfounded allegations regarding Iraqi weapons of mass destruction for years to come.

The United Nations was at the center of the WMD debate over Iraq and it will be at the center as we seek to address North Korea and Iran as well.

We cannot afford to be wrong about weapons of mass destruction again, and we cannot afford to have at the helm a man who has deliberately exaggerated intelligence regarding these devastating weapons.

There is also the question of pressuring colleagues and subordinates, even attempting to get people fired.

In response to Mr. Bolton's tactics as Undersecretary for Arms Control and International Security, Secretary of State Colin Powell reportedly came down to ask the analysts to continue to "speak truth to power." I applaud Secretary Powell for this step, but he should have never had to take it.

The Senate Intelligence Committee briefly addressed this issue of pressuring and seeking to remove analysts last year. However, we addressed this question only superficially, as I pointed out then in the committee's additional views on "The U.S. Intelligence Community's Prewar Intelligence Assessments on Iraq."

Even worse, our committee fell into the same trap of discouraging dissent. As I wrote then, "the conclusion section in the [committee] report rebukes the analyst for the temerity of raising a policy question with a State Department Undersecretary."

That analyst did the right thing. Policy questions should be raised. In fact, they should be welcomed.

If more questions had been asked, we might not have had a distinguished Secretary of State testifying at the U.N. with apparent certainty about weapons in Iraq that did not, in fact, exist.

The recent Silberman-Robb report from "The Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction" concluded that "the Intelligence Community was dead wrong in almost all of its prewar judgments about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction."

One of the key recommendations of the commission was to "preserve diversity of analysis" and to encourage debate among analysts.

These are the very impulses that Mr. Bolton apparently tried to stifle. These are the very impulses that we need most.

Mr. Bolton has been nominated to be our representative to the United Nations. In that seat, he will effectively become our representative to the world.

It is not a position that he has highly valued in the past. He famously remarked that "The secretariat building

in New York has 38 stories. If you lost ten stories today it wouldn't make a bit of difference."

Mr. Bolton has since explained that he was merely using a metaphor. I think most of us realized that. The point is that the metaphor that he chose indicates his low regard for the institution.

Mr. Bolton has stated that "there is no such thing as the United Nations," he has flatly rejected the idea at least once that the U.S. should pay its U.N. dues, and he has expressed his desire to see the Security Council reduced to one member, namely the United States.

Mr. Bolton is correct when he argues that the United Nations cannot be effective unless the United States plays a leading role. The League of Nations showed us that. Where he is mistaken is his fundamental confusion of leadership with domination.

A security council of one would leave us with no allies, no friends, and no supporters.

As we have seen with tragic clarity in Iraq, we are stronger when we have allies, and we are more effective multilaterally than unilaterally.

In its domestic policies, the Bush Administration has posited an ownership philosophy that implicitly tells us, "We are all alone in this." Mr. Bolton represents the international wing of that school of thought.

We see this very clearly with the issue of peacekeeping. This nominee has stated that he opposes the use of peacekeepers in civil conflicts because he does not regard civil conflicts as "threats to international security."

Mr. Bolton testified against United Nations involvement in the Congo, where at least 3 million people have died, and he opposed the U.N. civil administration missions in East Timor and Kosovo.

Humanitarian issues aside, civil conflicts have a tendency to spill over borders, just as the conflicts in Sudan, Rwanda, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of Congo have all become intertwined.

Moreover, civil conflicts can lead to failed states and failed states are very much a threat to national security.

We cannot have a representative to the U.N. who opposes one of its most basic and important functions.

Mr. Bolton has also dismissed the role of international law. In the late 1990s, he stated:

It is a big mistake for us to grant any validity to international law even when it may seem in our short-term interest to do so—because, over the long term, the goal of those who think that international law really means anything are those who want to constrict the United States.

I believe that international law means something.

I believe that international law is very much in our national interest, and I believe that this perspective from our potential ambassador to the United Nations is as damaging as a White House legal counsel or Attorney General who

dismisses the Geneva Convention as quaint and obsolete.

Most disturbing of all, Mr. Bolton has criticized any "'right of humanitarian intervention' to justify military operations to prevent ethnic cleansing or potential genocide."

That tells us Mr. Bolton has learned nothing from the bloodstained lessons of history, including the unforgivable failures of both the United States and the U.N. in Rwanda in 1994.

President Bush has rightly called the crimes in Sudan genocide. Secretary Rice recently echoed that judgment. The Administration has said that it has been blocked by other members of the Security Council in its attempts to do more to stop the killing in Darfur.

Is the United States going to appoint as our ambassador a man who not only belittles the U.N. but denies that it can or should intervene to prevent genocide? What possible message does that send on Darfur?

Another absolutely central United Nations function is the fight against the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Mr. Bolton has undermined non-proliferation efforts, not strengthened them.

Recently, 102 former ambassadors and high ranking diplomats wrote Senator LUGAR to express their deep concern over the Bolton nomination. They declared "John Bolton has an exceptional record of opposition to efforts to enhance U.S. security through arms control."

We are witnessing the results of the Bolton approach right now at the Non-Proliferation Treaty conference in New York. By all reports this conference is making little progress toward creating a stronger, safer non-proliferation regime.

A former senior Bush administration official told reporters, "Everyone knew the conference was coming and that it would be contentious. But Bolton stopped all diplomacy on it six months ago."

We cannot have our representative at the U.N. stopping diplomacy. He should be shaping it.

Finally, there is the question of judgment, a key quality in a diplomat.

Mr. Bolton was effectively banished from negotiations with North Korea after he launched into public attacks on their government and its leader on the eve of discussions. The State Department was forced to call Mr. Bolton back and send a replacement to the talks.

I cite this example not because North Korea does not merit criticism: By virtually any measure, it is one of the worst governments in the world.

But during Mr. Bolton's tenure, North Korea's nuclear weapons program has expanded, negotiations have deteriorated, and the situation has grown substantially more dangerous.

Ultimately, we return to Mr. Bolton's vision of the world and of the role of the U.N.

Let me conclude by turning to Samantha Power, one of our nation's foremost scholars of genocide and an astute observer of international relations.

Dr. Power has written:

It is unclear what the Bush Administration has in mind by shipping Bolton to New York. The appointment has been spun as "Nixon goes to China." Nixon, however, actually went to China: the visit was compatible with his world view. Bolton, by contrast, seems averse to compromise, and is apparently committed to the belief that the U.N. and international law undermine U.S. interests.

The United Nations is in need of reform. The same could be said of many of our own government institutions, as we are attempting to do with the intelligence community, for example.

The United States should be a positive influence in transforming the U.N. to meet the needs of the 21st century. But John Bolton is not the person for the job.

I cannot help but contrast John Bolton to John Danforth, a true statesman, a true soldier in the campaign to end the killing in Sudan, and a gracious and skilled United States representative to the United Nations.

John Danforth was unanimously approved for that position. Mr. Bolton is mired in a controversy of his own making over his suspect qualifications.

I cannot vote for a representative to the United Nations who demeans the institution, who works against non-proliferation, who abuses the intelligence process and its analysts, who dangerously inflates assessments of weapons of mass destruction, who rejects the value of peacekeepers and their role in civil conflicts, and who undervalues the principle of international law itself.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let me say at the outset, that I do not intend to vote for cloture on John Bolton, nor do I intend to support him for the position of United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

As I have said repeatedly since he was nominated, this is the wrong man for the job not because of his abrasive personality, although I am deeply troubled by his serial mistreatment of co-workers and subordinates.

My objections to this nominee go much deeper than his inability to work well with others. I am opposed to this nominee because of his poor performance, his flawed views, and his repeated misstatements and mischaracterizations of his record.

Let me commend Senator BIDEN and the Democratic staff on the Foreign Relations Committee and Senator ROCKEFELLER and his Intelligence Committee staff. As a result of their leadership and diligence, the Senate and the American people have a much more complete understanding of John Bolton and his entire troubling record.

And there is no doubt that we have learned a lot about Mr. Bolton. We have learned about his failures in the proliferation area, his repeated efforts

to manipulate intelligence, his numerous misstatements of fact, and his serial mistreatment of career civil servants.

But, in spite of the best efforts of Senator BIDEN and the other Democratic members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the record on this nominee is still incomplete.

Despite numerous requests, the administration has failed to turn over important information about this nominee. This is astounding to me. The administration's stonewalling has not only had the effect of slowing down the confirmation process, it has also put a further cloud over this individual and has—perhaps unnecessarily—raised the impression that the nominee and the White House have something to hide. The end result is further questions about this nominee, further disruption to the Senate's consideration of this nominee, and further demonstration of the administration's willingness to keep information from the Congress and the American people.

This is information that the Senate is entitled to under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution, information that is central to this man's qualifications, information that, had it been provided, could have possibly spared this man further questions about his already damaged reputation.

But as has so often been the case with this administration, they have sought to ignore the public's right to know and prevent Congress from making a fully informed decision. They want to be the judge and the jury. They have decided the information is not relevant to our consideration of Mr. Bolton.

Let me see if I understand their argument. The administration asserts that information that bears directly on Mr. Bolton's role in assessing the threat posed by Syria and in his seeking intercepted conversations of foreigners and U.S. citizens is not relevant to his qualifications to represent this Nation at the United Nations, and therefore should not be provided to the Senate.

After all the damage caused when this administration stretched the truth at the United Nations as it made the case for war in Iraq, does the White House really believe it is not relevant for us to be absolutely certain their nominee was not trying to stretch the intelligence yet again?

So we are in this largely avoidable position of having to vote against closure and extending debate until the information is turned over to the Foreign Relations and Intelligence Committees. I hope the administration will do the right thing and provide the information to the Senate.

In the meantime, the information the Foreign Relations Committee has managed to obtain is deeply troubling. This is a record which caused one of the most respected and storied committees in the entire Congress to not recommend him favorably to the full Senate. Based on that fact alone, the

President should have withdrawn the nomination. Unfortunately, since he didn't, I think the Senate should follow the committee's lead and not recommend him for this job either.

I know Mr. Bolton has tried to distance himself from certain parts of his record, like his past statements about the United Nations and its role in international affairs. However, there can be no denying that the man harbors a deep animosity towards the institution. At a time when we need diplomacy more than ever, and we need help in Iraq and in the global war on terrorism, this is exactly the wrong man to send to the U.N., and it sends exactly the wrong message to our friends and allies.

Mr. Bolton's supporters have advanced only one reason to ignore the weight of all the evidence that he is unqualified: Mr. Bolton believes the United Nations needs to be reformed. The U.N. does need to be reformed. The U.N. can improve its performance. It can reduce inefficiency in its bloated bureaucracy. It can become more effective and more relevant. And we ought to have a U.N. ambassador who is willing to take on that mission of reform. But the President should be able to find someone capable of reforming the U.N. without Mr. Bolton's baggage.

So let's be clear, I do not oppose sending someone to the United Nations who is willing to engage in some tough-minded reform. I do oppose sending someone who has misused intelligence and bullied intelligence analysts in a way that undermined our diplomatic corps and produced wrong-headed national security policies.

The facts show that Mr. Bolton repeatedly sought the removal of intelligence analysts who disagreed with him. In speeches and testimony, Mr. Bolton repeatedly sought to stretch intelligence to fit his views. In dealing with other professionals, Mr. Bolton repeatedly exhibited abusive behavior and intolerance that had a chilling effect on analysts' ability to provide different views.

The second highest ranking official at the State Department, Secretary Powell's Deputy Rich Armitage, was so concerned about Bolton speeches that he decreed that he must personally review and clear all of Mr. Bolton's public statements. And Robert Hutchings, chairman of the National Intelligence Council, said that Bolton took "isolated facts and made much more of them to build a case than I thought the intelligence warranted." He said the impact of Bolton's actions on the intelligence community, "creates a climate of intimidation and a culture of conformity that is damaging."

But this is not merely a concern for historians. At the same time that Mr. Bolton was agitating and undermining intelligence professionals on issues such as Cuba and Syria's WMD programs, the administration was putting together a dramatically hyped case for war in Iraq to deal with a threat from

weapons of mass destruction that turned out not to exist. Mr. Bolton's modus operandi of hyping intelligence and berating analysts has been so discredited by the results of the Iraq WMD fiasco that it will be difficult for him to operate in the future. Imagine Mr. Bolton arguing to the United Nations Security Council about the threat posed by Iran or North Korea's nuclear weapons programs. Why would anyone take him or the administration that sent him seriously?

I support the President's message of reform of the U.N. I am open to someone who can speak bluntly on these issues, who can deliver tough messages.

But we need a different messenger than Mr. Bolton.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I voice my support for John Bolton to be U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Undersecretary Bolton will bring to the table exactly what the U.N. needs now more than ever: a sure hand to guide much-needed reform.

The United Nations holds much promise today. But too often, it falls far short in its attempts to defend freedom, security, and human dignity. Undersecretary Bolton wants the U.N. to succeed, and believes it can be a great force for good.

Over the past 3 months we have all heard many scurrilous, slanderous personal attacks made against Undersecretary Bolton. However, as is often the case in Washington, the outrage is largely much ado over very little.

I believe that the opposition to him really stems from concern that he has so effectively implemented the President's foreign policy. Opponents do not want to take on the President, so they try to bully John Bolton.

The problem is, the U.N. is rife with corruption, scandal, and incompetence. Take the Oil-for-Food Program. What started as a humanitarian attempt to help Saddam Hussein's suffering victims degenerated into a jackpot for the tyrant's friends.

Evidence now shows that Saddam Hussein illegally profited from the program, and used the funds to build weapons for use against American troops. Millions of dollars in oil-soaked bribes may have gone to high-ranking officials in France, Russia, and within the U.N. itself. And most sickening of all, there is now evidence that Oil-for-Food money may be funding the insurgents that attack our soldiers in Iraq.

I commend my good friend Senator NORM COLEMAN from Minnesota for leading the committee that has uncovered these abuses. He is proving how much work lies ahead for Undersecretary Bolton when he arrives at the U.N.

As Undersecretary of State, John Bolton took the lead to realize the President's Proliferation Security Initiative, which strives to halt the spread of dangerous weapons. Thanks to his leadership, the once-dangerous regime in Libya has begun to be tamed,

as Libya has consented to the Initiative and begun the verifiable elimination of its weapons of mass destruction.

Undersecretary Bolton also led negotiations for the creation of the G-8 Global Partnership Against the Proliferation of WMD. Thanks to his diplomatic work, other nations contributed \$10 billion towards those efforts. And he led negotiations for the Treaty of Moscow, which reduced by two-thirds the number of operationally deployed strategic nuclear warheads.

As Undersecretary, Mr. Bolton secured 100 bilateral agreements ensuring that other countries will never drag American troops before the International Criminal Court on trumped-up, political charges and deprive them of American justice. It is remarkable that he has negotiated so many of these pacts—known as Article 98 agreements, for a section of the ICC treaty—in just 4 short years.

Undersecretary Bolton was a leader of American efforts to persuade the Security Council to pass Resolution 1540, which imposes standards for arms control, disarmament, and WMD proliferation prevention on every Member State.

So far, over 80 countries have outlined their plans to stop WMD proliferation. This is a tremendous step forward in the War on Terror, and much of the credit goes to Mr. Bolton. Thanks to his careful, patient work of diplomacy, Resolution 1540 not only passed the U.N. Security Council, it passed unanimously.

Let me close, Mr. President, with a reminder for my colleagues of how committed Undersecretary Bolton is to working with and reforming the U.N. to make it the sentinel of liberty that it can, and should, be. I will read two statements. One was made by Undersecretary Bolton, the other by the revered Democrat and New Dealer Dean Acheson, Secretary of State to President Harry S Truman. Let's see if you can guess who said what.

Here's the first one:

The United States is committed to the success of the United Nations, and we view the U.N. as an important component of our diplomacy . . . Walking away from the United Nations is not an option.

Now here's the second statement:

I never thought the U.N. as worth a damn. To a lot of people it was a Holy Grail, and those who set store by it had the misfortune to believe their own bunk.

One of these statements was made by the nominee, a man caricatured by his detractors as dead-set against the U.N. and the need for America to work with multilateral institutions. The other was made by the multilateralist who helped create the World Bank and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Well, surprise, surprise. The first statement was made by Undersecretary Bolton, and the second by Secretary Acheson. This just goes to show, Mr. President, that much of the criticism about Mr. Bolton is useless when it

comes to determining his commitment to the U.N., and his fitness to be the Ambassador.

I urge my fellow Senators to focus on the dire need for U.N. reform, and Undersecretary Bolton's record as a diplomat who can get results. In times like these the U.N. needs a little straight talk. And Undersecretary Bolton can give it to them.

He has a remarkable record of bringing about change through multinational institutions. I say, let him work his magic at the U.N. The U.N. can do better than what it is giving us, it must do better. John Bolton is the right man at the right time for this critical assignment.

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

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

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in 15 minutes or so, we will vote on the nomination of Under Secretary of State John Bolton to be ambassador to the United Nations.

I applaud President Bush for his selection. The President describes the Under Secretary as "a blunt guy" who "can get the job done" and "isn't afraid to speak his mind"—not even to the President himself.

We need a smart, principled, and straightforward representative to articulate the President's policies on the world's stage.

We need a person with Under Secretary Bolton's proven track record of determination and success to cut through the thick and tangled bureaucracy that has mired the U.N. in scandal and inefficiency.

A vote for John Bolton is a vote for U.N. reform. A vote for John Bolton is a vote for progress on the international challenges of our day. A vote for John Bolton is a vote for the United States.

It is no accident that polling shows most Americans have a poor view of the United Nations. In recent months, we have seen a deluge of negative reports. We now know that Saddam Hussein stole an estimated \$10 billion through the Oil-for-Food Program. The U.N. official who ran the operation stands accused of taking kickbacks, along with many other officials.

Just this week, the head of the Iraq Survey Group told the Council on Foreign Relations that as a result of the oil-for-food corruption, Saddam came to believe he could divide the U.N. Security Council and bring an end to sanctions. I commend Senator COLEMAN for his determined efforts to get to the bottom of this global scandal.

We know the U.N. failed to stop the genocide in Rwanda in the 1990s. The U.N. is on the brink of repeating that mistake in Darfur.

In the Congo, it is alleged that U.N. peacekeepers have committed sexual

abuse against the innocent female civil war victims they were sent to protect.

Meanwhile, the U.N.'s Human Rights Commission, which is charged with protecting our human rights, includes such human rights abusers as Libya, Cuba, Zimbabwe, and Sudan.

These failures are very real and very discouraging. They can be measured in lives lost and billions of dollars stolen. And they can be measured in the sinking regard for an organization that should be held in high esteem.

America sends the U.N. \$2 billion per year. Our contribution makes up 22 percent of that budget. We provide an even larger percentage for peacekeeping and other U.N. activities.

It is no surprise that Americans are calling out for reform. John Bolton is the President's choice to lead that effort. He possesses deep and extensive knowledge of the U.N. and has, for many years, been committed to its reform.

Back in 1991, Under Secretary Bolton successfully lobbied to repeal the U.N.'s shameful resolution 3379, which equated Zionism with racism. Many in the diplomatic community told him it could not be done. But after waging an aggressive campaign, he moved the U.N. General Assembly to repeal the resolution by a vote of 111 to 25.

As Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, John Bolton helped build a coalition of 60 countries to combat the spread of weapons of mass destruction through the President's Proliferation Security Initiative.

He was pivotal in our successful efforts to persuade Libya to give up its pursuit of weapons of mass destruction.

He was also the chief negotiator of the Treaty of Moscow, which calls upon the U.S. and Russia to reduce their nuclear warheads by nearly two-thirds.

Under Secretary Bolton has the confidence of the President and the Secretary of State, and it is to them he will report directly.

He has been confirmed by this body four times, and I believe if we are given the chance, he will be confirmed for a fifth time today.

The vetting of his current nomination has been exhaustive. The Foreign Relations Committee interviewed 29 witnesses and reviewed more than 830 pages of documents from the State Department, from USAID, and the CIA. Under Secretary Bolton fielded nearly 100 questions for the record and underwent multiple hearings.

As Senator LUGAR has pointed out, Under Secretary Bolton has served 4 years in a key position that technically outranks the post for which he is now being considered.

This is a critical time for the United States and for the world. Because of the President's vision and commitment, democracy is on the march around the globe.

In January, Iraq held its first truly free elections. Revolution has swept the Ukraine, Georgia, and Lebanon. We

are seeing political reforms in Egypt. Kuwait now allows a woman the right to vote. Saudi Arabia is slowly opening the door to democracy. The Middle East peace process is at its most hopeful moment ever.

The U.N. can and should be vital in advancing these developments. The U.N. charter states that the purpose of that organization is "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom."

I believe in the U.N.'s potential, if it is reformed and more rightly focused. It has been an important instrument of peace and dialog. I believe, as does the President, that an effective U.N. is in America's interest.

Ambassador Rudy Boschwitz, who has just returned from the 61st session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, puts it well when he says that:

Not only the United States, but the United Nations itself, needs and will profit from a no-nonsense representative like Mr. Bolton.

U.N. Secretary Kofi Annan, too, supports the Under Secretary's selection.

I thank my colleague Senator LUGAR for his strong leadership. And I also thank my colleagues Senators ALLEN, COLEMAN, SUNUNU, and ALEXANDER for their clear-eyed and unwavering support for this capable and fine nominee.

I will close with a story about John Bolton. When he was an intern in the Nixon White House, John Ehrlichman had gathered the interns together to tell them they had to work for Nixon's reelection. A young John Bolton piped up, "Work for him? I don't even know if I'm going to vote for him."

He has always been a straight-shooter and a man of integrity—exactly what we need at the United Nations, and exactly what the United Nations needs from us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 103:

William Frist, Richard Lugar, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Mitch McConnell, Jeff Sessions, Wayne Allard, Jon Kyl, Jim DeMint, David Vitter, Richard Shelby, Lindsey Graham, John Ensign, Pete Domenici, Robert Bennett, Mel Martinez, George Allen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on Executive Calendar No. 103, the nomination of John Robert Bolton to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Murkowski
Allen	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Ensign	Pryor
Bond	Enzi	Roberts
Brownback	Graham	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Shelby
Burr	Hagel	Smith
Chafee	Hatch	Snowe
Chambliss	Hutchison	Stevens
Coburn	Inhofe	Sununu
Cochran	Isakson	Talent
Coleman	Kyl	Thomas
Collins	Landrieu	Thune
Cornyn	Lott	Vitter
Craig	Lugar	Voinovich
Crapo	Martinez	Warner
DeMint	McCain	

NAYS—42

Akaka	Dorgan	Lieberman
Baucus	Durbin	Lincoln
Bayh	Feingold	Mikulski
Biden	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Frist	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Harkin	Obama
Byrd	Jeffords	Reed
Cantwell	Johnson	Reid
Carper	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Clinton	Kerry	Salazar
Conrad	Kohl	Sarbanes
Corzine	Lautenberg	Schumer
Dayton	Leahy	Stabenow
Dodd	Levin	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Inouye Specter

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 56, the nays are 42. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I entered a motion to reconsider this vote to allow us to revisit this issue when we return. We will be doing that. We will be closing shortly this evening, but before we close, I will file cloture motions on the Brown nomination and the Pryor nomination. Our next vote will be Tuesday, June 7, and that vote will occur prior to the policy luncheons, probably at noon on June 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, while we have Senators in the Chamber, I wish to express, through the Chair, the appreciation of especially Senator BIDEN and Senator DODD for the ends to which the majority leader went to try to resolve this issue. He spent an inordinate amount of time trying to get the information requested and was unable to do so. He did get information but not all that was necessary. I am disappointed that tonight we were unable to have a vote on Mr. Bolton, but it is not the fault of the Democratic caucus. We are not here to filibuster Mr. Bolton's nomination. We are here to get information regarding Mr. Bolton, information to which we are entitled. The people who voted against cloture—there were many—many of them will vote against Mr. Bolton if, in fact, he gets before the Senate. But most of the people here tonight are concerned about this being an issue dealing with the administration not giving us the information we want. That is all. It hurts their nominees. The administration has to be more forthcoming.

I hope that during the next 8 or 9 days the administration will take a fresh look at this and give the information to Senator DODD and Senator BIDEN—most of what they want. They are the only ones who will see it. It will not be given to the entire Senate. They are not asking for information that may affect our country's national interest.

I hope we can go forward with the people's business. The distinguished majority leader told me yesterday that he was going to file cloture on these two judges. This is fine. We will work out a timely manner to complete the work on these judges and other judges. The Energy bill was reported out of committee today. The asbestos bill was reported out of committee today. There is a lot we have to do here, and we do not want this to be a divergence—the work we have to do is a divergence, but it is not the fault of the Democratic Senators that it is a diversion.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I wish to make it clear to all my colleagues, speaking for myself, that I have absolutely no intention to prevent an up-or-down vote on Mr. Bolton. The issue here is about whether the executive branch will provide information which the majority leader tried yesterday and today to get, and which I think almost every Senator here would acknowledge the institution is entitled to get. We are prepared to not even ask that the ranking member and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee see the information we have sought. I implore the administration to provide the information, and—speaking for myself, and I can speak for no one else, but I

believe my colleagues on my side would agree with me—we are willing to vote 10 minutes after we come back into session if, in fact, they provide the information—information to which Mr. Bolton's staff had access but which they will not give to the majority leader of the Senate. There is no reason offered.

I want to make it clear, we are ready to vote the day we get back, the moment we get back. We are ready to vote immediately if they would come forward, meeting us halfway on providing the information. That is all.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, needless to say, I am very disappointed with where we sit today. We have had an interesting week, a very challenging week, starting the week on one clear direction and then sidetracked a little bit to what I thought was not an unreasonable feeling in this body that we were going to be working together and that we were going to address the important issues to America.

John Bolton, the very first issue to which we turned, we got what to me looks like a filibuster. It certainly sounds like a filibuster, looking at the vote today, it quacks like a filibuster, and I am afraid, shortly after we thought we had things working together in this body again, we have another filibuster, this time on another nomination—not a judicial nomination but another nomination—the nomination of John Bolton.

It does disappoint me. We had an opportunity to finish and complete this week with a very good spirit. We are going to come back to this issue. As has been said by Senator BIDEN, as I have said, we are going to revisit it, but I think what America has just seen is an engagement of another period of obstruction by the other side of the aisle, and it looks like we have, once again, another filibuster.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, everyone here should understand that it is now the 26th day of May. This is the first filibuster that has been conducted in this Congress, if, in fact, we want to call this a filibuster—No. 1, first one. We have not been doing filibusters. We worked through some very difficult issues we talked about here before—bankruptcy, class action, and a number of other issues.

So it is not as if we are looking for things to have extended debate on. We need to work together, and I think this week has established that. We are going to work together. But how can we work together when information is not supplied?

So I hope we will all slow down the rhetoric during the break. This is something that happened. This is part of the Senate. I repeat, keep in mind, this is the first filibuster of the year and maybe the last. I hope so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes and that Senator SUNUNU speak after me for up to 10 minutes as well to discuss bipartisan legislation the two of us have introduced today.

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

(The remarks of Mr. WYDEN and Mr. SUNUNU pertaining to the introduction of S. 1128 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that after Senator SUNUNU's remarks, Senator REED be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order has already been entered.

Mr. REED. I also ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of my remarks, Senator SALAZAR of Colorado and then after that Senator PRYOR of Arkansas be recognized.

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

RETIREMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERAL DANIEL J. KAUFMAN, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Brigadier General Daniel J. Kaufman, United States Army, Dean of the Academic Board at the United States Military Academy at West Point. General Kaufman is retiring on the 6th of June, 2005 after 37 years of active military service in war and peace. His military career exemplifies the finest traditions of the United States Army and demonstrates the rare combination of a combat-tested soldier and a first-rate scholar.

I have had the privilege of knowing Dan Kaufman since 1967 when I entered West Point and was assigned to Company C, Second Regiment, United States Corps of Cadets. Dan was a senior, or as we say at West Point, a "Firstie," shorthand for first classman. He distinguished himself to me as a serious and conscientious Cadet with a wry sense of humor. He ranked academically in the top 5 percent of his class. But, like all of his classmates, Dan's attention was focused on Vietnam as much as academics.

Upon graduation in 1968, General Kaufman was commissioned as an second lieutenant in the Armored Cavalry and assigned to F Troop, 2d Squadron, 6th Armored Cavalry Regiment, Ft. Meade, MD as a platoon leader. After 6 months at Fort Meade, General Kaufman deployed to Vietnam and served as platoon leader in L Troop, 3d Squadron, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment.

Later in the tour he served as the Troop's executive officer. For his service in Vietnam, General Kaufman was awarded the Bronze Star with V-device for Valor and two Purple Hearts.

Upon completion of his tour in Vietnam, General Kaufman served from 1970–1971 as the Commander of E Troop, 2d Squadron, 6th Armored Cavalry Regiment, Ft. Meade, MD. General Kaufman left Fort Meade in 1971 to attend the Armor Officer Advanced Course at Fort Knox, KY. After a tour of duty as an instructor at the armor school, General Kaufman attended the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. Here, we again renewed our friendship as we were both students at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. By that time, Dan had married his beloved wife Kathryn and their daughter, Emily, was born in Mount Auburn Hospital in Cambridge, MA. General Kaufman then served as an instructor and assistant professor in the Department of Social Sciences from 1974 to 1978. I joined Dan as an instructor in the Department of Social Sciences for the academic year 1977–1978.

After departing West Point, General Kaufman served as Special Assistant to the Director, Planning Analysis, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Policy) in Washington, DC prior to reporting into Ft. Bragg, North Carolina. Once at Fort Bragg, General Kaufman assumed the duties of Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, Force Development, 82nd Airborne Division until 1979. From 1979 until 1981, General Kaufman was the S-3 (Operations), 4th Battalion (Airborne), 68th Armor, 82nd Airborne Division.

Following his assignment at Fort Bragg, General Kaufman completed the Armed Forces Staff College in route to Cambridge, MA to study for his Ph.D. in political science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. After earning his Ph.D., General Kaufman rejoined the faculty at West Point as a permanent associate professor in the Department of Social Sciences.

In 1990, he was appointed Professor and deputy head of the Department of Social Sciences. During this time, he served as chair for Accreditation Review Committee, Scholarship Committee, and Faculty Development Committee. From 1991 through 1995, General Kaufman served as a key member of several Department of the Army committees, including Chief of Staff of the Army transition teams for both General Sullivan and General Dennis J. Reimer, President-Elect Clinton's DOD Transition Team, as well as a special assistant to the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army (1991–1992).

In 1996, General Kaufman was appointed Professor and Head of the Department of Social Sciences. There he continued the proud tradition of soldiers and scholars, first begun by GEN "Abe" Lincoln right after World War II, carried on by GEN Don Olvey, by GEN Amos Jordan, and General Gold- en, and now GEN Dan Kaufman.