

and they would use oil resources to punish industrialized nations. And they would use those resources to fuel their radical agenda, and pursue and purchase weapons of mass murder. And armed with nuclear weapons, they would blackmail the free world, and spread their ideologies of hate, and raise a mortal threat to the American people. If we allow them to do this, if we retreat from Iraq, if we don't uphold our duty to support those who are desirous to live in liberty, 50 years from now history will look back on our time with unforgiving clarity, and demand to know why we did not act.

I'm not going to allow this to happen—and no future American President can allow it either. America did not seek this global struggle, but we're answering history's call with confidence and a clear strategy. Today we're releasing a document called the "National Strategy for Combating Terrorism." This is an unclassified version of the strategy we've been pursuing since September the 11th, 2001. This strategy was first released in February 2003; it's been updated to take into account the changing nature of this enemy. This strategy document is posted on the White House website—whitehouse.gov. And I urge all Americans to read it.

Our strategy for combating terrorism has five basic elements:

First, we're determined to prevent terrorist attacks before they occur. So we're taking the fight to the enemy. The best way to protect America is to stay on the offense. Since 9/11, our coalition has captured or killed al Qaeda managers and operatives, and scores of other terrorists across the world. The enemy is living under constant pressure, and we intend to keep it that way—and this adds to our security. When terrorists spend their days working to avoid death or capture, it's harder for them to plan and execute new attacks.

We're also fighting the enemy here at home. We've given our law enforcement and intelligence professionals the tools they need to stop the terrorists in our midst. We passed the PATRIOT Act to break down the wall that prevented law enforcement and intelligence from sharing vital information. We created the Terrorist Surveillance Program to monitor the communications between al Qaeda commanders abroad and terrorist operatives within our borders. If al Qaeda is calling somebody in America, we need to know why, in order to stop attacks. (Applause.)

I want to thank these three Senators for working with us to give our law enforcement and intelligence officers the tools necessary to do their jobs. (Applause.) And over the last five years, federal, state, and local law enforcement have used those tools to break up terrorist cells, and to prosecute terrorist operatives and supporters in New York, and Oregon, and Virginia, and Texas, and New Jersey, and Illinois, Ohio, and other states. By taking the battle to the terrorists and their supporters on our own soil and across the world, we've stopped a number of al Qaeda plots.

Second, we're determined to deny weapons of mass destruction to outlaw regimes and terrorists who would use them without hesitation. Working with Great Britain and Pakistan and other nations, the United States shut down the world's most dangerous nuclear trading cartel, the AQ Khan network. This network had supplied Iran and Libya and North Korea with equipment and know-how that advanced their efforts to obtain nuclear weapons. And we launched the Proliferation Security Initiative, a coalition of more than 70 nations that is working together to stop shipments related to weapons of mass destruction on land, at sea, and in the air. The greatest threat this world faces

is the danger of extremists and terrorists armed with weapons of mass destruction—and this is a threat America cannot defeat on her own. We applaud the determined efforts of many nations around the world to stop the spread of these dangerous weapons. Together, we pledge we'll continue to work together to stop the world's most dangerous men from getting their hands on the world's most dangerous weapons. (Applause.)

Third, we're determined to deny terrorists the support of outlaw regimes. After September the 11th, I laid out a clear doctrine: America makes no distinction between those who commit acts of terror, and those that harbor and support them, because they're equally guilty of murder. Thanks to our efforts, there are now three fewer state sponsors of terror in the world than there were on September the 11th, 2001. Afghanistan and Iraq have been transformed from terrorist states into allies in the war on terror. And the nation of Libya has renounced terrorism, and given up its weapons of mass destruction programs, and its nuclear materials and equipment. Over the past five years, we've acted to disrupt the flow of weapons and support from terrorist states to terrorist networks. And we have made clear that any government that chooses to be an ally of terror has also chosen to be an enemy of civilization. (Applause.)

Fourth, we're determined to deny terrorist networks control of any nation, or territory within a nation. So, along with our coalition and the Iraqi government, we'll stop the terrorists from taking control of Iraq, and establishing a new safe haven from which to attack America and the free world. And we're working with friends and allies to deny the terrorists the enclaves they seek to establish in ungoverned areas across the world. By helping governments reclaim full sovereign control over their territory, we make ourselves more secure.

Fifth, we're working to deny terrorists new recruits, by defeating their hateful ideology and spreading the hope of freedom—by spreading the hope of freedom across the Middle East. For decades, American policy sought to achieve peace in the Middle East by pursuing stability at the expense of liberty. The lack of freedom in that region helped create conditions where anger and resentment grew, and radicalism thrived, and terrorists found willing recruits. And we saw the consequences on September the 11th, when the terrorists brought death and destruction to our country. The policy wasn't working.

The experience of September the 11th made clear, in the long run, the only way to secure our nation is to change the course of the Middle East. So America has committed its influence in the world to advancing freedom and liberty and democracy as the great alternatives to repression and radicalism. (Applause.) We're taking the side of democratic leaders and moderates and reformers across the Middle East. We strongly support the voices of tolerance and moderation in the Muslim world. We're standing with Afghanistan's elected government against al Qaeda and the Taliban remnants that are trying to restore tyranny in that country. We're standing with Lebanon's young democracy against the foreign forces that are seeking to undermine the country's sovereignty and independence. And we're standing with the leaders of Iraq's unity government as they work to defeat the enemies of freedom, and chart a more hopeful course for their people. This is why victory is so important in Iraq. By helping freedom succeed in Iraq, we will help America, and the Middle East, and the world become more secure.

During the last five years we've learned a lot about this enemy. We've learned that

they're cunning and sophisticated. We've witnessed their ability to change their methods and their tactics with deadly speed—even as their murderous obsessions remain unchanging. We've seen that it's the terrorists who have declared war on Muslims, slaughtering huge numbers of innocent Muslim men and women around the world.

We know what the terrorists believe, we know what they have done, and we know what they intend to do. And now the world's free nations must summon the will to meet this great challenge. The road ahead is going to be difficult, and it will require more sacrifice. Yet we can have confidence in the outcome, because we've seen freedom conquer tyranny and terror before. In the 20th century, free nations confronted and defeated Nazi Germany. During the Cold War, we confronted Soviet communism, and today Europe is whole, free and at peace.

And now, freedom is once again contending with the forces of darkness and tyranny. This time, the battle is unfolding in a new region—the broader Middle East. This time, we're not waiting for our enemies to gather in strength. This time, we're confronting them before they gain the capacity to inflict unspeakable damage on the world, and we're confronting their hateful ideology before it fully takes root.

We see a day when people across the Middle East have governments that honor their dignity, and unleash their creativity, and count their votes. We see a day when across this region citizens are allowed to express themselves freely, women have full rights, and children are educated and given the tools necessary to succeed in life. And we see a day when all the nations of the Middle East are allies in the cause of peace.

We fight for this day, because the security of our own citizens depends on it. This is the great ideological struggle of the 21st century—and it is the calling of our generation. All civilized nations are bound together in this struggle between moderation and extremism. By coming together, we will roll back this grave threat to our way of life. We will help the people of the Middle East claim their freedom, and we will leave a safer and more hopeful world for our children and grandchildren.

God bless. (Applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, good morning.

(The remarks of Mr. CARPER pertaining to the introduction of S. 3846 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

#### NOMINATION OF JOHN BOLTON

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, at this moment in history our Nation faces enormous challenges from terrorism, Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Israel and the occupied territories, Sudan's Darfur region, Iran, North Korea, Syria, HIV/AIDS, global health generally, climate change, energy security, and the list seems endless. These are all important issues that call out for important action and leadership from the United States.

America's capacity to respond to this global clarion call has been seriously circumscribed, in my view, by the Bush administration's preemptive war of choice in Iraq—circumscribed militarily, politically, and economically. The options have become fewer since March 19, 2003, as the world has become more dangerous, and the reputation and global standing of the United States has become weaker.

Our friends know this. More importantly, so do our adversaries, apparently.

That is why it is imperative that we make the most of the options still available to respond to these challenges. Diplomacy is one of the few options that remain available with a reasonable political and minority pricetag. As John Kennedy said so eloquently more than 45 years ago, this Nation should never fear to negotiate but never negotiate out of fear. It is going to take effective and pragmatic diplomacy to build the kinds of international partnerships and coalitions to address the challenges that confront us so that America can feel safe and be safer and more secure.

While the United Nations isn't the only forum for the conduct of that diplomacy, it is very clear that President Bush has placed much more reliance on the United Nations Security Council in his second term in office than he certainly did in the first. Be it Iran, North Korea, Darfur, or Lebanon, the United States has turned to the Security Council to respond to humanitarian crises and other threats to international peace and stability.

That is why, more than at any other time in recent years, since the founding of the United Nations, that it matters who sits in the United States chair on that Council. In my view, Mr. John Bolton does not fit the bill.

Based on information developed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year from unprecedented committee testimony by former Assistant Secretary of State Carl Ford and more than 30 staff interviews of then-current and former colleagues of Mr. Bolton in the Bush administration—in the Bush administration, I might add—the Senate made the decision not to act on that nomination.

Carl Ford and 12 of those interviewed were extremely critical of Mr. Bolton, including retired COL Lawrence Wilkerson, chief of staff to Secretary Powell; Thomas Fingar, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research; former Deputy Director of the CIA, Stuart Cohen; and Robert Hutchings, former acting head and head of the National Intelligence Council, respectively; and Jamie Miscik, former Deputy Director of Intelligence at the CIA.

These are not light people; these are serious people, all of whom served in the Bush administration. Here is what some of them had to say about this nomination. Again, these were Bush appointees, people who served in the

Bush administration. Listen to Carl Ford, the Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

Mr. Bolton is a “quintessential kiss-up, kick-down sort of guy.”

Mr. Bolton has “a bigger kick and it gets bigger and stronger the further down the bureaucracy he's kicking.”

Mr. Bolton is a “serial abuser.”

I have never seen anyone quite like Secretary Bolton—doesn't even come close. I don't have a second and third or fourth in terms of the way that he abuses his power and authority with little people.

I consider myself to be a loyal Republican and conservative to the core. I'm a firm and enthusiastic supporter of President Bush and his policies, and I'm a huge fan of Vice President Cheney, who I worked with when he was Secretary of Defense.

With respect to the Bolton's treatment of Westermann, Mr. Ford went on:

The attitude, the volume of his tone, and what I understand, the substance of the conversation, he was so far over the line that he meets—he's one of the sort of memorable moments in my 30-plus-year career [in public service for the Federal Government.]

Again, this is a Bush appointee about whom we are talking.

Listen further. Larry Wilkerson, lieutenant colonel, chief of staff to Secretary of State Colin Powell in a telephone interview, Lieutenant Colonel Wilkerson said:

Do I think John Bolton would make a good ambassador to the United Nations? Absolutely not.

He is incapable of listening to people and taking into account their views.

He would be an abysmal ambassador.

Listen further to Mr. Wilkerson:

I differ from a lot of people in Washington, both friend and foe of Under Secretary Bolton, as to his “brilliance.” I didn't see it.

I saw a man who counted beans, who said “98 today, 99 tomorrow, 100 the next day,” and had no willingness—and, in many cases, no capacity—to understand the other things that were happening around those beans. And that is just a recipe for problems at the United Nations.

Lastly, Mr. McLaughlin, Deputy Director of the CIA, responding to a question as to whether other policymakers had sought to remove CIA analysts:

No. This is the only time I had ever heard of such a request . . . I reacted strongly to it. I didn't think it was appropriate.

I will return to that particular point in a few minutes, this idea of attempting to fire intelligence analysts.

These are just some of the quotes, again, of people who served in the Bush administration commenting on the nomination of John Bolton to be our ambassador to the United Nations.

There have been some excellent U.S. representatives to the United Nations over the years: Henry Cabot Lodge, Adlai Stevenson, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, or former colleague Jeane Kirkpatrick, and Richard Holbrooke, just to name a few. Each and every one of these individuals possessed a certain skill and ability to work with others, our adversaries as well as our friends,

in order to stretch the U.N. as an institution in ways that supported U.S. interests. None of them were shrinking violets, to put it mildly.

It is very clear that Mr. Bolton does not possess that skill set. Over the years, Mr. Bolton evidenced great skepticism and disdain for the United Nations and multilateral diplomacy generally.

Nothing he has said or done since assuming his current position in New York suggests that he has altered his views on the United Nations or on multilateral diplomacy generally.

Once again, it is those who have worked most closely with him who are his biggest critics. More than 30 ambassadors with whom Mr. Bolton serves at the United Nations—all supportive of U.N. reform—questioned his leadership abilities.

In a July 21, 2006, New York Times article, one U.N. colleague characterized Mr. Bolton as “intransigent and maximalist.” Another suggested that Mr. Bolton's “high ambitions are cover-ups for less noble aims, and oriented not at improving the United Nations, but at belittling and weakening it.” A third has essentially written off working with Mr. Bolton. “He's lost me as an ally now, and that's what many other ambassadors who consider themselves friends of the United States are saying.”

Mr. Bolton's response to a question posed by Senator COLEMAN at his July nomination hearing was stunning to me. Our colleague, NORM COLEMAN, asked the following question:

Mr. COLEMAN. You knew the organization, you were involved in it, then you were on the outside. Now you're there. Is there—has your impression of the U.N. changed? Has there been anything that surprised you in the last year?

Mr. BOLTON. Not really.

That is a response of an individual who is so entrenched in his views that he is incapable of the kind of openness and flexibility that I think most in this Chamber believe is essential if the United Nations Security Council is going to be made to work to serve our interests around the globe.

Mr. Bolton clearly has an aversion to being diplomatic. He has even been called a bully by some of his harshest critics. Mr. Bolton's personality is really not the issue as far as I am concerned. There are a lot of bullies in this town, and I suspect in New York as well. My objection isn't that he is a bully, but that he has been an ineffective bully. He can't win the day for the United States when it really counts. He isolates the United States rather than builds consensus around U.S. positions.

Mr. Bolton showed his colors, in my view, as soon as he arrived in New York after receiving his recess appointment last August 2005. After the U.S. mission had worked for months to negotiate a 2-year reform effort that was to be endorsed by President Bush and other heads of State 2 weeks later, Mr. Bolton almost destroyed the consensus

around the document by tabling 705 separate amendments to the text. It took the involvement of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to cobble the agreement back together at the last minute at a price of losing some of the provisions that the United States had sought be included with respect to management reforms.

The Bush administration has made the ongoing crisis in Darfur a key concern. Yet when in June of this year members of the Security Council visited the Sudan to send a signal to the Government of Khartoum that it was on the wrong track, Mr. Bolton thought it more important to travel to London to deliver a U.N. bashing speech to a private think tank rather than join his colleagues on a visit to Sudan and carrying on a message of how important we think the genocidal behavior is.

On another occasion, prior to a vote last July on a U.N. Security Council resolution intended to sanction North Korea for its provocative Fourth of July missile launches, Mr. Bolton publicly assured anyone who would listen that he could get support for a resolution with teeth, with the so-called chapter 7 obligations. It turns out he couldn't. The resolution adopted by the U.N. Security Council fell far short of that.

Last September, Mr. Bolton told the House International Relations Committee that the negotiation of an effective Human Rights Council was a key objective of the United States and that it was a "very high priority, and a personal priority of mine."

There were 30 negotiating sessions held to hammer out the framework of this new Human Rights Council, and Ambassador Bolton managed to attend just one or two of those sessions.

In the end, the United States was one of four countries to vote against the approval of the U.N. Human Rights Council.

When the tally is taken on how effective Mr. Bolton has been at the U.N., in my view he gets a failing grade overall.

These are key positions that help to strengthen the United States, and yet in case after case, from reform, to Darfur, to North Korea, to the U.N. Human Rights Council—critical issues to strengthen the United States—our ambassador has failed in getting the kind of results that are critically important.

But there is more.

On the basis of those issues, I urge my colleagues to vote against Mr. Bolton, but I am going to go a step further because I believe other actions taken by Mr. Bolton are so outrageous that Mr. Bolton does not even deserve a vote, in my view.

There is Mr. Bolton's well-documented attempts to manipulate intelligence to suit his world view and seek the removal of at least two intelligence analysts who wouldn't play ball. When these analysts refused to support intel-

ligence conclusions not supported by available intelligence, Mr. Bolton mounted a concerted effort to have them fired. The fact they were not removed does not excuse his actions.

I don't mind a heated debate. I don't mind people having serious disagreements with conclusions. But when you attempt to fire lower level employees who are responsible for gathering intelligence for the United States because you don't like their results, that is dangerous business indeed.

I do not care in which administration you may serve. Any individual, in my view, who attempts to doctor evidence to fire people whose conclusions they disagree with when it comes to intelligence gathering does not deserve to be promoted to the high position of ambassador to the United Nations.

His behavior, in my view, endangers our national security because it goes to the very heart of what we depend upon to protect that security—unbiased professional intelligence collection and analysis. Mr. Bolton stepped away and he stepped over the line and committed an offense so grievous, in my view, it warrants that this Senate deny him an up-or-down vote on his nomination.

In concluding, Mr. President, I return to the point I made earlier; namely, that Mr. Bolton has largely burned his bridges with his colleagues in New York and is not likely to be an effective diplomat when his diplomacy is increasingly becoming the coin of the realm in protecting and advancing U.S. interests at this very unstable moment in this country.

Fifty nine former U.S. Ambassadors and diplomats who have served in five administrations, Democratic and Republican, agree. Yesterday, they sent a letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee strongly opposing this nomination—59 former U.S. Ambassadors.

I mentioned earlier the number of people in the Bush administration who are outspokenly critical of this nomination. What more do we need to hear, what more do we need to hear that this is a bad nomination and one that is going to jeopardize the interests of the United States? Those Ambassadors recognize, as do I, that at this critical moment in our Nation's future, the President should put the Nation's interests first and nominate an individual with strong diplomatic skills who believes in diplomacy rather than placating his conservative base by continuing to push for the nomination of an unsuitable nominee.

I believe it is time for the Senate to send that message loudly and clearly to the President by rejecting efforts to ramrod this nomination through in the closing days of this session.

I urge my colleagues to join me in strongly opposing this nomination.

Mr. President, I yield floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 5631, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5631) to make appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Kennedy-Reid amendment No. 4855, to include information on civil war in Iraq in the quarterly reports on progress toward military and political stability in Iraq.

Allen modified amendment No. 4883, to make available from Defense Health Program up to \$19,000,000 for the Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Center.

Feinstein-Leahy amendment No. 4882, to protect civilian lives from unexploded cluster munitions.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, what is the pending business on this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Feinstein amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Is the Kennedy amendment still set aside following that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is.

Mr. STEVENS. 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.

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4882

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I understand it is appropriate for me now to speak on an amendment I offered yesterday having to do with cluster bombs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss again the amendment offered by myself and Senator LEAHY to this bill on the use of a munition called a cluster bomb. Our amendment is very simple. It prevents any funds from being spent to purchase, use, or transfer cluster munitions until rules of engagement have been adopted by the Department of Defense to ensure that such munitions will not be used in or near any concentration of civilians.

That is not a difficult requirement. It seems to me, because of the widespread damage caused by these munitions, that there ought to be specific rules of engagement which ban their use in areas where civilian death or maiming might result.

Cluster munitions are large bombs, rockets, or artillery shells that contain up to hundreds of small submunitions or individual bomblets. They are intended for attacking enemy troop formations, and they release these small