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 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 civilians, career employees, 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. 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 pursuant to the 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.

НОМИНАЦИЯ ИОНА РОБЕРТА БОЛТОН СБЫТЬ ПРЕЗИДЕНТСКИЙ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАТИВСТВО ОСОБСТВЕННОСТИ США К ОБЩЕСТВЕННОМУ ДЕЯТЕЛЬЮ ВТОРОГО РОМА НАЦИЙ—Окончание

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 tended to make the Senate 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, about 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 were determined 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 conducting 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 laws 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 and handlers of U.S. identities contained in signals intelligence products. None of the individuals interviewed indicated there was anything improper or inappropriate about Mr. Bolton’s requests. Mr. Bolton’s requests were also 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 minimized identities by Mr. Bolton’s requests, which was also briefed by the President.

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 would suggest anything improper in Mr. Bolton’s activities. This is all a smokescreen. There is nothing there.

The last point on this matter has to do with the fact that the Senate did not allow the Committee to 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; these names 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 that administration 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 smoke screen 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. I am aware 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 Weapons of Mass Destruction. 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. We approved it 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 our 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, and 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 created 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 Religion and 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 John Bolton? 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 they use diplomacy at the United Nations? Who do we want 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 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 the President wants to send to our United Nations, I am aware of that he has done in his position of Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

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 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 nominee—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. 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 SAR-BANES, 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 expressed intelligence analysts to produce intelligence conclusions at odds with the facts. He continually sought to exaggerate the intelligence about Cuba’s possible biological weapons and support for terrorism. He continued 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 apparently 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.

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, to understand that our interests are interlocking and that we must pursue our own self-interest in the only possible way in the long run, that is, by cooperation with other nations. . . . 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 acting 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 whom 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 the United States Senate on the confirmation of Mr. 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 twice 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, including many of concern peacekeeping activities, of the United Nations who supports that vision. It is time to move forward from Bush appointees.

The crux of the objections is very specific, very credible allegations that Mr. Bolton sought to shape 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 shape intelligence to fit an ideological bias. Let me emphasize, these are objections coming forward from Bush appointees, 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 not be used to fit policy viewers. Dissent within the intelligence community should not be muzzled or suppressed; it should be respected and encouraged.

The United States Senate should be sending the clear signal stating that 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 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 we 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 inspections 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 thereby strengthen the NPT, 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 virtually no 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:

Since leaving, 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—a 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 “patchwork Nation.”

I would say the policy has been less about patience and more about paranoia—a dangerous situation for a nation 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 reform the United Nations. Its 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 away.

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.

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 with the United Nations. It is inexcusable 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, serves 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 the embattled 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 still believe he is 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 would like 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 same effectiveness? 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 have been well qualified to take on 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). Mr. Martinez. Mr. President, I rise strongly to 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 so because 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 to serve 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 spoken in an off-the-cuff manner. 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 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 this great institution 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, reticent 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, engaged in no small way in telling them the truth. He wrote about his life called “Silent Missions” that provides good evidence.

We have in 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 watching the 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 some way, believe that the United Nations bureaucracy could use some streamlining? More interesting than
effort, Cuba has provided dual use bio-tech-
nology to rogue states. We’re concerned that
such technology could support bioweapons
programs in those states. We call on Cuba to
cease providing these applicable coopera-
tion with rogue states and to fully comply with
all its obligations under the Biological
Weapons Convention.

I believe these are responsible re-
marks. I believe those are timely re-
marks. I believe those are remarks that are intended to make the world safer and to make America safer from terrorism by bioweapons. Sharing bio-
weaponry 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 direct-
ness, 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 time the Senate,
after a Presidential appointment, has sought to confirm Mr. Bolton, most re-
cently as Under Secretary of State for
Arms Control and International Secu-

A number of states around the world
dispose great danger and concern. We
spoke about Cuba. It is one of those.

The second issue is the qualifications
of Mr. Bolton to be ambassador to the
United Nations. It is a

The second issue is the qualifications
of Mr. Bolton to be ambassador to the
United Nations. It is a

Mr. Bolton’s nomination to be Assistant
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 the road 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
track, and 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 discus-
sion of this very issue. Again, elections
have consequences. President Bush’s
approach to proceeding with the six-

We cannot blame Mr. Bolton for these
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 weap-
ons of mass destruction dismantling ef-

to develop a complete absence of any
nuclear fuels cycle activities and fully coopera-
tions of mass destruction dismantling ef-

The EU—particularly UK, France,

In Libya, our policies have met with
success. Negotiations on Libya’s weap-
ons of mass destruction dismantling ef-

The fact is that, along with many of
these other allegations that have real-
ly nothing to do with the qualifications
and competence of Mr. Bolton, has
been found to be either without merit
or with 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 lit-
tle disturbing and disappointing how
easily and with little hard evidence a
person’s reputation can be tarnished.

So far, the State Department, as my

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 at the U.N.

Mr. Bolton has a strong record of ac-
complishment. 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 dy-
namics in which the Middle East 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.

Finally, I want to express with great
great pleasure that I support the nomi-
ation of John Bolton to be the next Per-
manent Representative at the U.N.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator 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 thor-
oughly about Mr. Bolton’s nomination.
So far, the State Department, as my

The fact is, some of these allegations
have been found to be completely de-
void of any merit. In fact, the majority
report on the Melody Townsel case—
one of those that was so sensational,
that committee of 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 ever oc-
curred.

The fact is that, along with many of
these other allegations that have real-
ly nothing to do with the qualifications
and competence of Mr. Bolton, has
been found to be either without merit
or with 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 lit-
tle 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

It was instrumental in establishing
the Proliferation Security Initiative,
which is a potentially useful frame-
work, but as CRS pointed out:
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the nomination of Mr. Bolton to be ambassador to the United Nations.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

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 follow-through 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 Biological 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. Mr. Bolton was involved in negotiations with 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 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. Mr. 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 continuing negotiations. Again, more style than substance, more press release than real progress.

Mr. Bolton has been involved in international security issues which led to a significant break-through. Mr. Bolton’s record to date, his attitude to date suggests he will not be an effective ambassador to the United Nations, where he becomes one of the chief diplomats in our diplomatic arsenal, if you will.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will 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 many 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’s 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 that are 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 this could support biological weapons programs in those states. We call on Cuba to cease all biological weapons application cooperation with rogue states and to 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 bio-technology to rogue states. We are concerned that we should support biological weapons programs in those states. We call on Cuba to cease all biological weapons applicable cooperation with rogue states and to fulfill 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 of this 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 draper 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, 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 worry 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 prevails in 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 dictatorships 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 people in caring for the world. There have been a number of these 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. It 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 years, 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, 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 have killed innocent individuals.

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 using their tools for preventing 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 to bring down dictacies and despotism. 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 regime of global arms control 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 not 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 nonproliferation 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 warheads 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. The 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 should Recognize that is in need of some reforms 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.

In my view, John Bolton has 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 glimmers of light have been quashed, and the suffering of the people 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.

I hope we will work with John Bolton and the United Nations in developing peace and democracy in the region. And, in fact, the effectiveness of the United Nations will at best be a beginning toward the creation of those of these around 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 some reforms to regain its relevancy and its credibility.
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So I yield the floor. The Senator from Wisconsin, who did vote for him earlier, for his current position, all of these—Senators BIDEN, S ARBANES, and the Russians are all very important but as a practical matter the ones who really prop up that regime in 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; they could have gotten 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 Block 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—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. It is clear that the United Nations 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 part of 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 do 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.
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 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 blatan
tly inaccurate explanations of what he would do in the United Nations 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 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 intertemperance 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 clearly or could clear. This wasn’t a case in which the State Department’s intelligence analysts alone had concerns about Bolton’s proposed language. The CIA, the Department of Energy, and the Defense Intelligence Agency all objected. 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 he had already 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, 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 statements or perhaps even made some that were perhaps even misleading or inaccurate public characterizations of important security issues. And Mr. Bolton repeatedly tried to suppress inconvenient truths from his public presentations to be cleared by Larry Wilkerson, Secretary Powell’s Chief of Staff, or Deputy Secretary Armitage himself.

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 him, 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 sanctions issues because the attorney had raised 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 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 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 the world. 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, absent any perceived policy disagreements, 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. The Intelligence Oversight Committee, the Silberman-Robb Commission, and numerous other investigations into the major intelligence failures that have gravely harmed our credibility and our security over the years have consistently called for greater efforts to promote a policy of accommodation 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 intellectual self-censorship that is a formality 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 serious 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 willingness to discharge 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 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.

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 Administration’s efforts to realign 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 James 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 weapons of mass destruction.

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 this testimony strong support of former Secretaries of State Jim Baker, Larry Eagleburger, Al Haig, Henry Kissinger, and Senator 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, who endorsed Mr. Bolton 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 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 attend was a surprise 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 Mr. Bolton had, in his words, chewed out people on down the line and didn’t like the fact that Mr. Bolton had been rude to staff members and perhaps he deserves to be embarrassed by 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 Larry Eagleburger, the Foreign Service officer’s Secretary of State. He had opposed Mr. Bolton to work with him in the West.

Perhaps he has learned a lesson. But it hardly merits a vote against confirmation when balanced against his many accomplishments.

That is Larry Eagleburger, the Foreign Service officer’s Secretary of State. He has enormous respect from those people with whom he has worked. He had 27 years in the Foreign Service. We have 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 Eagleburger is a Foreign Service Officer’s Secretary of State. He had and has enormous respect from those men and women who are 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 Eagleburger 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 Eagleburger 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 with which to challenge the intelligence assessments 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.”

John Bolton has a distinguished background and record. He has dedicated his life to improving and strengthening 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 Mr. 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 was the piece of work 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. 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 Committee 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. The prices are high. We have a million blue-collar manufacturing jobs in the chemical industry that will go overseas if we do not find some way to deal with this. Senator Bingaman did his big surprise to our country. Our next 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 45,000-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 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 hydro-power 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 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 us to 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, in geothermal, in wind, in 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 electricity from nuclear power, coal, and gas.

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 President Office comes from. By the year 2018, according to the National Hydropower Association, there will be 30,000 MW of hydropower plants that are going to have to be relicensed. That is 10 percent 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 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 1960s, 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 power. Yet we have not built a nuclear power plant 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 power plants that are safer than those that are already operating.

Senator DOMENICI has come up with an imaginative loan guarantee program that would help launch an entire new generation of nuclear powerplants. Senator CRAG, Senator DOMENICI, and Senator BINGAMAN have come up with a program based on the idea of funding 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 clean 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 pollution 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 back 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. Even if then 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 like-

The problem of how to burn coal in a clean way, then the rest of the world is like-

The New York Times business sec-

The New York Times business sec-

tion had an excellent article on this on Sunday that Senator DOMENICI gave to me on the 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 mercu-

curry part of the pollution, but it does not solve the carbon part of the pollution.

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 carbon, we could burn coal and 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 McCaın-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 plants. 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 will 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-
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 environment.

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 to be able to store electricity. You can’t store 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 together as was hoped.

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 law 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 $1 billion to spend and we spend $3 billion for renewable natural gas or renewable fuel, we will only have $8 billion left to spend on everything else, and nearly 3.5 to 4 of it will 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 diesel cars 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. There 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, suggests Senator JOHNSON.

I am not a member of the Finance Committee, and I am not a member of the Energy Committee, but I have suggested to commercialize coal gasification for powerplants and $300 million to make more effective support of another renewable energy, which is wind power, 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 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 the $3.7 billion in 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, and Senator BINGAMAN said today, he doesn’t remember that 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 here today when Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN announced the results at a press conference.

So I honor them for their leadership. I hope the American people are proud of DOMENICI and BINGAMAN as Senators. New Mexico has already been proud of them from the same Senate. Even though we have CAFE standards still to debate, MTBE still to debate, we have some final work to do on how 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 achieved that.

By Kenneth J. Stier

Almost a decade ago, Tampa Electric opened an innovative power plant that burned 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 do both eliminate the greenhouse gases linked to climate change.

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 higher, 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 40 percent more expensive to build than a conventional plant that burns pulverized coal. This complicates financing, especially in markets, where utilities must persuade regulators to set aside their customary standard of requiring utilities to use their lowest-cost alternative. One of the things considered was a 40 million dollar bet on a project 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 change it again,” said James S. Grumet, the executive director of the National Commission on Energy Policy.

The commission, an independent, bipartisan organization, 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 limited carbon emissions by saying 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 the industry consider inevitable, but unlikely soon—gasification technology will catch on only as its benefits for the power sector, have been widely used in the chemical industry for decades, and the general manager of the gasification plant run by Cinergy, a heavily coal-dependent Midwestern utility, is one of the technology’s advocates for the first time, something that many industry leaders and sympathetic lawmakers and policymakers have been pursuing. 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 a $950 million deal to demonstrate gasification’s full potential—not just for power plants but as a source of 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 Madoff, deputy director for the Edison Electric Institute, a trade association whose members, shareholder-owned utilities, account for about a fourth 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.

An overall 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 a carbon cap, we would like to see it to be on the list of things to do quite early.”

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-leased land—until industry experts, the federal government, 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. Tennessee, 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 windmills slowly turning and generating water for the families. 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 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.

Most 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. Each tower costs more than $1 million 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.

Our country needs a national clean energy policy, not a national windmill policy. TVA is a national leader in producing clean energy for the nation. Smoky Mountain is a 20-year contract.

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 the 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 the U.S. Senate, Washington, DC, May 23, 2005.

HON. SKILLA HARRIS, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, TN.

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

DEAR SKILLA AND BILL: Recently Sen. John Warner of Virginia and I introduced the “Energy Security and 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-leased land—until industry experts, the federal government, 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. Tennessee, 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 windmills slowly turning and generating water for the families. 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 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.

Most 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. Each tower costs more than $1 million 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.

Our country needs a national clean energy policy, not a national windmill policy. TVA is a national leader in producing clean energy for the nation. Smoky Mountain is a 20-year contract.

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 the 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 the U.S. Senate, Washington, DC, May 23, 2005.
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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, even the Wind Energy Association statistics suggest that three out of four windmills would not be built across the country because they aren’t cost-competitive.

Once those tax credits expire, TVA ratepayers would likely have to pick up most of the tab for the higher cost of the power. These windmills may be elegante, 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 Knoxvile, as much power as TVA’s new Brown’s Ferry nuclear plant.

Because they only work when the wind blows (90 to 90 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. Power 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.

Chatanooga has just spent 20 years improving its waterfront, saving the Tennessee River Gorge and renaming itself the Scenic City. Our 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 Mountain and, in my view, destroy the landscape?

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, where the same amount of money might, for example, give $1,500 incentives to more than 2 million hybrid car or diesel vehicles. As chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority Congressional Caucus, I intend to do my best to make local officials and residents whose futures are on the line 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. Why are we 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, as a form 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 resource 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 land, clumps of dark 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 government site 27 turbines, each almost the height of St. Paul’s Cathedral, on the ridge of Whinash energy’s most potentially explosive phase. Two is Cumbria’s future, the broad-caster Melvyn Bragg and the mountaineer Sir Chris Bonington, are scheduled to give evidence. Days later, the site’s remotest Shap Wells Hotel. There can be no place for 21st-century windmills in a Wilder-ness largely-unaltered for centuries, they will all 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 cli- mate 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 to be met in 2012 as well as the acid test of whether they can expect that re- newable energy will provide 10 percent of power in five years’ time, require new transmission lines, must be subsidized by massive federal tax breaks, and, in my view, destroys the landscape.
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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, where the same amount of money might, for example, give $1,500 incentives to more than 2 million hybrid car or diesel vehicles. As chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority Congressional Caucus, I intend to do my best to make local officials and residents whose futures are on the line 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. Why are we considering what the appropriate policies should be, I hope that TVA will help by placing a two-year moratorium on any new wind farms.
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LAMAR ALEXANDER,  
United States Senator.
wind farms in sensitive areas. ‘We shouldn’t sacrifice our landscape on our crowded is-
land. Wind doesn’t make sense.’

Others, the so-called ‘blade lovers’, wel-
come the aesthetic asset, believing that their beauty lies in the environmental message they communicate to a throwaway society. Designer Wayne Hemingway says: ‘I love the massive visual sign that we are doing something that is not damaging the Earth.’

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I suggest the quorum call be rescinded.

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 mi-
nority controls 50 minutes of the time
remaining.

Mr. KERRY. Fifty?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am told 50.

Mr. KERRY. How much does the ma-
jority have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ma-
jority controls 52 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator controls 30 minutes of the time al-
located.

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 For-
eign Relations Committee during the 
time leading up to this debate on the 
floor. I listened to Senator BIDEN’s com-
ments and I listened to Senator BIDEN’s 
comments with Senator SARK.

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 argu-
ments, 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 po-
litical in the sense that it is sort of an 
automatic reflex reaction to a nomina-
tion of the President, or to divisions 
between the parties.

I think people can sense from the bi-
partisan concerns that have been ex-
pressed, as well as the record that has 
been set forward, that these are really 
deeply felt and very legitimate con-
cerns about a position that is one of 
the most important foreign policy posi-
tions for our country.

Obviously, the President has the 
right to make a choice. We all under-
stand that. Subsequent to the Presi-
dent making that choice, an enormous 
amount of information has come for-
ward, not from traditional sources, not 
from people who might have been dis-
posed to oppose this nomination, but 
from people who have worked with Mr. Bolton, from people who are ideologi-
cally in the same place as he is, who 
are members of the same administra-
tion.

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 credi-
bility, special stature, and special abili-
ty to be able to carry the message of 
our country in one of the most impor-
tant fora in the world, in a very com-
plexed world.

On several occasions, a number of 
Senators have talked about this issue 
of credibility, and it cannot be over-
looked, because it is real. We are 
in the midst of delicate, critical nego-
tiations with Iran. Nobody knows 
where that will go in these next months. The potential for critical in-
telligence analysis to be put before the 
United Nations in order to persuade 
the world of potentially dangerous 
steps requires a voice that has no ques-
tions 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 Pow-
ell, whom we all admire but who was 
sent to the United Nations with infor-
mation 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 at-
titude 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 in-
formation that the Foreign Relations 
Committee has requested a number of 
times. Two weeks ago, the Foreign Re-
lations Committee, in a historical mo-
moment, voted to send John Bolton’s 
nomination without recommendation. I 
was one of 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 hun-
dreds of nominations to the floor with 
favorable recommendations. Only 
twice did the committee report a nomi-
nation unfavorably, and only once did 
it report a nomination without rec-
ommendation. 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 thoroughly. Some of 
these requests involved additional in-
formation related to specific cases the 
committee had been reviewing. Four of 
them were requests for drafts of speec-
hes or testimony. These four re-
quests were designed to stretch the 
time line to inquire whether Mr. Bolton 
had sought to stretch

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

After the committee decided on April 
19 to further investigate allegations 
concerning the Bolton nomination, the 
administration continued to drag 
its feet on the Democratic request for 
information. On April 29, Senator BIDEN 
sent a letter specifying nine dif-
ferent categories of documents relating 
to the issues of concern that needed to 
be investigated thoroughly. Some of 
these requests involved additional in-
formation related to specific cases the 
committee had been reviewing. Four of 
them were requests for drafts of speec-
hes or testimony. These four re-
quests were designed to stretch the 
time line to inquire whether Mr. Bolton 
had sought to stretch
Senators 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, which Senator Dodd originally asked for these intercepts in a question for the record on April 11. The Department responded by saying that the committee asked to get these from the National Security Agency, and 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 intercepts. The chairman of the committee—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 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 this 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 to have them 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 was able to see intercepts 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 the intercepts.

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 way ex-Egyptian 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. In fact, the 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 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. Gruddingly, 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 vote against the 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 important 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 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 from her views or being a launched 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. We 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 standard. She is a staunch conservative who speaks her mind. 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 standard. She is a staunch conservative who speaks her mind. 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 think my time is about up, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.
Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). 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 called to order on 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. 2. We would like to know 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 of the proudest moments 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 my view, 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 temperament, about his working relationships. 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 man 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 that the President could 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 standing up to bad people. Sometimes it is hard to determine who is good and who is bad, 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 from 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.

In my view, what we need 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, all of them 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.

He has been accused in the past that he would do 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, the tumultuous time that he’s been confirmed in 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 have a vote today, our 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. I urge them to read the 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, interpersonnel 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, send 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 is sent to the U.N., with “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. reform but “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 bureaucratic 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. 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 replace somebody 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 into question his 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 Wilkinson, testified before the committee that Mr. Bolton would make “an abysmal ambassador” because of his management flaws.

I would like to read from Mr. Wilkinson’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 he said about U.N. reform are not relevant to our decision on whether he is the right man for the job. Mr. Bolton has been the second-ranking official in the State Department. Mr. Bolton contributed to this 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 attacks on Mr. Wilkinson, for example, discredited the U.S. intelligence community and undermined the credibility of the United States. In the case of Mr. Bolton, his poor management techniques intimidated intelligence officers and it begins the process; it begins with intimidation. Mr. Bolton contributed to this atmosphere of intimidation and pressure on analysts, and it ends with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

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. That is not true. Mr. Bolton has been the second-ranking official in the State Department. Mr. Bolton contributed to this 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 attacks on Mr. Wilkinson, for example, discredited the U.S. intelligence community and undermined the credibility of the United States. In the case of Mr. Bolton, his poor management techniques intimidated intelligence officers and it begins the process; it begins with intimidation. Mr. Bolton contributed to this atmosphere of intimidation and pressure on analysts, and it ends with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

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. That is not true. Mr. Bolton has been the second-ranking official in the State Department. Mr. Bolton contributed to this 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 attacks on Mr. Wilkinson, for example, discredited the U.S. intelligence community and undermined the credibility of the United States. In the case of Mr. Bolton, his poor management techniques intimidated intelligence officers and it begins the process; it begins with intimidation. Mr. Bolton contributed to this atmosphere of intimidation and pressure on analysts, and it ends with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. Mr. Bolton contributed to this atmosphere of intimidation and pressure on analysts, and it ends with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. Mr. Bolton contributed to this atmosphere of intimidation and pressure on analysts, and it ends with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.
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 in which we can 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 do so. 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 arguments. 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 Republicans 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? This was not 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 recommending 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 I ask: Whichever individual 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 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 made yesterday. It was decided early in 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 the nomination. I wanted to just sit down and say that this is something I believe in and say that this is something 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 present here have 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 have 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, we cannot turn our backs on our constituencies 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 yield the floor. I am grateful 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 want to dispel 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, have been.
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 too often has exhibited 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 he has a proper 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, never be conditioned on U.N. approval.

John Bolton, whose career in foreign policy began in 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—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 have 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. Actions 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 character assassination and 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 on a number 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 character attacks on Mr. 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.

Demand that after all the delay, the President leave it to my colleagues to attempt 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 Mr. Bolton’s nomination to a vote today. Mr. Bolton understands this, as does John Bolton.

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 policies for which he is sometimes criticized. But the policies for which he is sometimes criticized are policies for which many in the intelligence community have now been hailed, or in his post-911 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 criticisms for which he is criticized are those of the President and the Department of State which he has served with loyalty, honor, and distinction.

I believe President Bush has a 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 hampered 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 to the United Nations. 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 and 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 a very knowledgeable 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 the 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 an opportunity we are going to stand up for this coequal branch of Government’s rights to review relevant information in the exercise of our constitutional responsibilities and to have 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 responsibilities.

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; it matters that 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 seen none.

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 NSA official who was 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 who 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 used these personal identities.

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 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 that the President has in his 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, as printed in today’s RECORD under “Morning Business.”

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, once again, I come to the floor to voice my concern 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. That 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 both destructive 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 the importance of American culture.

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 consider the appointment 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 the stick, rewards and sanctions. 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 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 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 they 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 reports. The 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. We must be permitted to fit a particular ideology or political agenda.”

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 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 a person of 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 C.I.A. to seek the removal of one intelligence officer. At any time, but especially in the wake of the massive intelligence failures associated with the Iraq war, 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. We must be permitted 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. interests, rebuild trust 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 be principled, temperate, 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 department. 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 our Permanent Representative, 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.

I believe it 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 ultimately voted 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 global 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 of international stature 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.

If President Bush would make the rebuilding of our friendships and alliances a priority for the next four years.

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, Mr. 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 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 U.S. 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 become an 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 indisputable 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; harassed 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 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 ensuring the United Nations' 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 humiliation of 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 do not accept his position in the U.N. as 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.

On the other hand, 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 inflame our fears by 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 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 damned 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 normally hire Mr. Bolton for assessing our 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 responsibility, 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 messages will not 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 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.

And Mr. Bolton's failure to understand 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 compounded 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 great 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.

I am 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; the conduct of foreign affairs with all the astuteness or artfulness in securing advantages without arousing hostility.

That definition does not sound like the Mr. Bolton we have heard about.

As much as we might like to think 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.

We know that 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 fails short.

For example, in 2002, he sought to exaggerate assessments of Syria's nuclear, chemical and 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 witnesses 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 as an official 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 the Nation's Ambassador to the United Nations.

These former diplomats have served in both Democratic and Republican administrations. 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."

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 pressure 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 United Nations and an agent of change in the international community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have timed the reservation 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 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 position 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 shielded away naming rogue states that violate international commitments such as the Biological Weapons Convention, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Mr. Bolton 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’s 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 has succeeded in bringing 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 “from the get-go.” Policymakers should question information extensively before accepting it as fact. These were internal policy debates, which occur in all Departments and agencies.

He has 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 performance of the duties of 10 U.S. officials who were cited in intelligence intercepts.

The administration’s failure to provide requested and relevant documents distorts the 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 hide 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 not 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 weights 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. Secretary Powell did this step, but he should have never had to take it.

The Senate Intelligence Committee briefing addressed this issue of pressuring and seeking to remove analysts later. 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 like Colin Powell 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 with certainty.”

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 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, 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 posted 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 said that he opposes the use of peacekeepers in civil conflicts because he does not regard civil conflicts as “threats to international security.”

Mr. Bolton tested 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, thus 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 wish to internationalize our country’s foreign policy is to make us an international law puppet. International law really means anything are those who want to constrain 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 a 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 capacity to oppose 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. But his leader at the time of these 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 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 nomination because of his poor performance, his flawed views, and his repeated misstatements and miscalculations 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 this is not in doubt in 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 numerosous misstatements of fact, and his se-
crual mistreatment of career civil serv-
ants.

But, in spite of the best efforts of Senator BIDEN and the other Demo-
crats, members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the record on this
nominee is still incomplete.

Despite numerous requests, the ad-
administration has failed to turn over
important information about this
nominee. The president has a duty to pro-
vide the Senate with a meaningful eval-
uation of the nominee and the admin-
istration’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 con-
tent clause of the Constitution, infor-
mation that is central to this man’s
qualification to represent this Nation.

But as so often been the case
with this administration, they have
sought to ignore the public’s right to
know and prevent Congress from mak-
ing 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 argu-
ment. The administration asserts that
information that bears directly on Mr.
Bolton’s role in assessing the threat
posed by Syria and in his seeking inter-
cepted 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 are we in this largely unavoidable
position of having to vote against clus-
ture and extending debate until the
information is turned over to the Foreign
Relations and Intelligence Commit-
tee. I hope the administration will do
the right thing and provide the infor-
mation 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 rec-
commend him favorably to the full Sen-
ate. 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 rec-
commend him for this job either.

I know Mr. Bolton has tried to dis-
tance himself from certain parts of his
record, like his position about the
United Nations and its role in
international affairs. However, there
are no denying that the man har-
bors a deep animosity towards the in-
sitution. At a time when we need dis-
covery and the truth, 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 ad-
vanced 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.S. should do its part.

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 dialogue. But sending
someone who has misused intelligence
and bullied intelligence analysts in a
way that undermined our diplomatic
corps and produced wrong-headed na-
tional security policies.

The facts show that Mr. Bolton re-
peatedly sought the removal of intel-
lence analysts who disagreed with
him. In speeches and testimony, Mr.
Bolton repeatedly sought to stretch in-
elligence to fit his views. In dealing
with foreign diplomats, Mr. Bolton re-
peatedly exhibited abusive behavior
and intolerance that had a chilling ef-
fact on analysts’ ability to provide dif-
ferent views.

The second highest ranking offi-
cial at the State Department, Secretary
Powell’s Deputy Rich Armitage, was so
concerned about Bolton’s statements that
he decreed that he must personally re-
view and clear all of Mr. Bolton’s pub-
lic statements. And Robert Hutchings,
Vice Chairman of the Intelligence
Council, said that Bolton took “iso-
lated 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 intel-
lence community, “creates a climate
of intimidation and a failure of con-
formity 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 pro-
grams, 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 dis-
credited 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 Na-
tions 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 don’t want some-
one 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 Na-
tions. 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 free-
dom, security, and civilization. Un-
dersecretary 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 per-
sonal attacks made against Undersec-
tary Bolton. As often in the case in Wash-
in, 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 Presi-
dent’s foreign policy. Opponents do not
really stems from concern that he has
so effectively implemented the Presi-
dent’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 vic-
tims has degenerated into a jackpot for
the tyrant’s friends.

Evidence now shows that Saddam
Hussein illegally profited from the pro-
gram, 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 insurg-
ants that attack our soldiers in Iraq.

I commend my good friend Senator
NORM COLEMAN from Minnesota for
leading the campaign to uncover
these abuses. He is proving how
much work lies ahead for Undersec-
retary Bolton when he arrives at the U.N.

As Undersecretary of State, John
Bolton took the lead to realize the
President’s Proliferation Security Ini-
tiative. It will be difficult to check 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 Initiative 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 bent on working 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. 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 multilateral influence. 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 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 failure 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, China, and North Korea.

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.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 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 for the job of 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 LUOGAR 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.
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. INOUYE), 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:

YEAS—56

Alexander—DeWein
Allard—Dole
Allen—Domenici
Bennett—Ensign
Bond—Enzi
Brownback—Graham
Bunning—Grassley
Burns—Gregg
Chafee—Hatch
Chambliss—Hutchison
Cochran—Icone
Cochran—Isselk
Coles—Kyl
Collins—Lezinski
Cornyn—Lott
Craig—Lugar
Crapo—McCains
DeMint—McCain

NAYS—42

Akaka—Dorgan
Bayh—Durbin
Biden—Feinstein
Bingaman—Frist
Boxer—Harkin
Byrd—Jeffords
Cantwell—Johnson
Carpenter—Kennedy
Clinton—Kerry
Conrad—Kohl
Conrad—Lugar
Dayton—Leahy
Dodd—Levin

NOT VOTING—2

Insurge—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 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 just as we adjourn today's business, 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 divergence.

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 had 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 must give the Senate. I implore the administration to provide the information, and—speaking for myself, and I can speak for no one else, but I

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. says 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 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:


The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.
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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 in the chair.

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 sides have asked 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 of 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, in every session we deal with an issue, 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, a very unlikely 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 have not been doing filibusters. We worked through some very difficult issues, but I thought 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 proved 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. If well to discuss bipartisanship 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 after the conclusion of my remarks, Senator Salazar of Colorado and then 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 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 F 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, as Company Commander of the Armor Platoon, 3d platoon, and as an instructor at the Armor school.

From 1971 to 1975, 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, Fort Knox, Kentucky. 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.


Following his assignment at Fort Bragg, General Kaufman completed the General 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 transition teams, including the Army Transition Team, as well as a special assistant to the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army (1991–1993).

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 John F. Kennedy and continued by GEN Robert H. Barrow, in the 1960s, and GEN Anthony C. Zinni, in the 1990s. General Kaufman was responsible for much of the academic reform that took place at West Point during the 1990s.

General Kaufman was confined to a wheelchair due to complications from a stroke suffered in 2003, and he sought early retirement. As a result, he is now the 12th Army Museum Director in Cambridge, MA.

As we recognize the accomplishments of Brigadier General Daniel J. Kaufman, United States Army, it is important that we consider the contributions that he made to our Nation and our military.

General Kaufman was commissioned as a 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.