

Again, I thank Senator FRIST for living up to his commitment he made to me. I appreciate it. What we are going to do is continue to work to let everyone know how outrageous this law is, how far reaching this law is, how dangerous this law is to women, how it walks away from family values, from States rights, from anything decent when one says to a woman who has been raped or is the victim of incest that she is on her own. That is not what this country is about.

At some point, we are going to make sure that this Weldon amendment is either modified so it becomes what it says it is, which is a conscience clause that no one has an objection to, or is repealed.

How much more time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 23 minutes remaining.

JOHN BOLTON NOMINATION

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to close on a couple of topics. The first one, because I sit on the Foreign Relations Committee, is the nomination of John Bolton to be our Ambassador to the United Nations. I do call on the President to rethink this nomination. Out of the thousands of strong, conservative Republicans who care about the world, there has to be somebody better than someone who has a pattern of not only abusing his staff, called a serial abuser by one witness, but also, and this is really threatening, trying to get them fired if they do not give him the information he wants.

I am talking about false information and reaching down from the very high level at which he has been to the bottom of another agency that he did not even have direct line control over and trying to force not one but two and maybe three intelligence analysts to paint a picture that he wanted to use so that he could present a country as an imminent threat to this Nation, which could have led to some serious ramifications. Of all the people to pick now, it should not be someone who would try to politicize intelligence gathering.

I received another letter on Friday, which I sent to both sides of the committee. I hope this will be looked at. It concerns a case where years ago John Bolton was trying to overturn a U.N. resolution—or have it modified—that dealt with infant formula in the developing nations. Some of my colleagues may remember that issue, where babies were dying throughout the developing world because they were mixing the baby formula with contaminated water, and the U.N. voted very strongly to stop distributing and selling that baby formula. According to this woman, who has a lot of credentials—an attorney who worked with John Bolton—she said that Bolton ordered her to contact these developing nations and tell them to back off and modify

this resolution so that Nestle Company and others could sell their product in the developing world. And this is interesting—conscience clause—she said: My conscience does not allow me to do this because if one baby died as a result of what I did, I could not live with myself. There is a conscience clause in the agency that says if somebody has a conscience problem when given an assignment, they do not have to do it. Well, Bolton said, if you do not do this, you are fired, and he fired her on the spot, according to her. She is going to go under oath and testify to this. Then he found out he could not fire her because she was protected by Civil Service. She comes back to work, and what do they find? Her entire office had been moved. Where is it moved? To the basement of the building. No telephone. A desk and a chair. She loved her job, and she eventually got a telephone down there and worked around John Bolton and stayed there doing her work.

This is yet another story. So we have a pattern of abusive behavior. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle say, this is just the person we need for the U.N.—somebody tough. If you want someone in the U.N. who has a history of trying to change intelligence information—and now the world knows it.

As my ranking member JOE BIDEN has stated, this is the guy who may have to make the intelligence case against Iran. This is the guy who may have to make the intelligence case against North Korea with this background of using political pressure to get the kind of intelligence he wanted to build a case. This is not the right person. We do not want someone there who will politicize intelligence gathering. I don't think we want someone there who is such a hothead that it will turn a lot of people off.

We have testimony from multiple sources. At first, my friends on the other side of the committee said it is an isolated incident; you are talking about one incident. We have incident after incident.

Oh, he is just the person we need. We want someone tough. Tough is one thing. Tough and principled and committed is one thing. Abusing people is something else. A man is called a serial abuser by someone who has the credentials to know—e-mails back this up—trying to get people fired because they want to do their job.

It was so bad that Colin Powell, the Secretary of State, had to actually go and talk to all these “independent” analysts; his message was, don't you worry about it. You continue to do your work. I thank him for that. The testimony is clear. He went there and told those analysts, don't you be bullied. I am using those words. But the message he had was, don't you worry about it. Do your work. Do your job. It is very clear.

How refreshing it was to see Senator VOINOVICH, at the committee, listen to what Senator BIDEN, in particular, was

saying. They had the information, chapter and verse, proof of why this is not a good appointment.

I know the pressures that have come to bear on Senator VOINOVICH. It is not pleasant to be alone. I have been there. I know how it feels. But he is answering to his conscience. I think he did the Senate proud by doing that.

Now we hear other colleagues on the committee saying maybe they need more time and more information.

Again, this can all be avoided. There are so many other people who can do this job. I said before that John Bolton is very loyal to this conservative doctrine. There could be many positions for him in the administration. We need someone in the spirit of John Danforth—Republican, conservative, wonderful former Senator who went to the United Nations, who immediately had the support and the credibility and the respect.

In closing, I will talk about an issue I know the Presiding Officer has been very involved with, and that is the filibuster issue. As someone who once wanted to end a filibuster myself at an early stage, I now understand how foolish I was at that point. Why did I want it to end when I first came here as freshman? We had the majority and the Republicans were thwarting us. It was very frustrating. We wanted to fix everything. I voted to say this filibuster has to go.

Little did I realize that is the way the Senate is supposed to operate in a deliberative fashion. As one of the Founders said, the House is the cup. It gets hot. It is steaming. And when the issues get to the Senate, it is the saucer. They cool down. One of the ways to ensure that is to have extended debate.

FILIBUSTER

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, there has been so much misinformation on the filibuster I want to make sure I put my thoughts into the record. We hear Republican Senators actually get up and say they never filibustered any judges. I was stunned, so we went back into history and we have a chart for that.

The first filibuster in modern times was started by the Republicans in 1968 against Abe Fortas for the Supreme Court. We know there have been 11 in recent times, 11 filibusters. Here is one in 1971, probably started by the Democrats, William Rehnquist to be a Supreme Court justice. Here is one in 1980, probably started by the Republicans, Stephen Breyer, to be a judge on the First Circuit Court of Appeals. Then in 1984 Harvie Wilkinson, Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. In 1986, Sydney Fitzwater, to be a judge for the Northern District of Texas. 1992, Edward Earle Carnes to be judge on the Eleventh Circuit. 1994, Lee Sarokin to be a judge on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. In 1999, Brian Theodore Stewart, to be a judge for the District