

mother came from St. Louis, MO, so I feel that I am particularly blessed by the presence of this Chaplain today.

SCHEDULE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, by previous order, the Senate will begin 30 minutes of debate on the Holbrooke nomination; that is, the Honorable Richard Holbrooke, to be Ambassador to the United Nations, with a vote to occur at approximately 10 o'clock today. Following disposition of the Holbrooke nomination, the Senate will resume consideration of the Interior appropriations bill with amendments expected to be offered and debated. In addition, when the Senate receives the tax reconciliation conference report from the House of Representatives, it is expected that the Senate will begin consideration of that legislation. Therefore, Senators should expect votes during the day and into the evening during today's session of the Senate.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

That is from the distinguished majority leader, Mr. LOTT.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will go into executive session to consider en bloc Executive Calendar Nos. 135 and 140, which the clerk will report.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard Holbrooke, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard Holbrooke, of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there now shall be 30 minutes of debate equally divided to be followed with the vote en bloc on the nominations.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Now, Mr. President, I thank the Senate leadership with respect to this nomination. It has been a unique one for various reasons. The elements of that uniqueness are well

known to my colleagues. I shall not speak in detail about the tradition of "holds" but I think much of the general public is somewhat perplexed about the procedures in the Senate.

There has been discussion as to the procedure on this nomination and the use of what is referred to as a "hold." There is a diversity of views within this body on the use of a "hold," but, in my judgment, it is an important and proper procedure utilized by Senators in conjunction with what I view as the balance of power established by the Constitution in the coequal branches of the Government: the executive branch, the power of nomination by the President, and the Senate and its power of advice and consent.

The use of the hold is an exercise of that balance of power between the two branches. In this instance, I thank the distinguished majority leader and, of course, the minority leader, and others who have worked to bring this nomination to this point where today the Senate will render its advice and consent on this very important nomination.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. I thank many other Senators who have worked with me—Senator HAGEL, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator VOINOVICH, and my distinguished colleague from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN who will be speaking momentarily. I yield for the comments of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to put a question to the Senator on the hold because I have been reading newspaper reports that I think have completely misinterpreted how the hold process operates. These reports have alleged that the Senate rules contain a provision that enables any Member of the Senate, in effect, to hold up action either on a nominee or on legislation and sort of that is that. That is not the case.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is correct; it is tradition—

Mr. SARBANES. It is a courtesy that is extended to a Member when he places a hold. The leadership can move ahead if the Member is being recalcitrant. Of course, it is up to Members to exercise a hold with some self-restraint. They may get the extra time they need, but, in my judgement, it ought not to be used as a weapon that completely submerges the nomination or the legislation.

I interjected because I am very concerned. I have read a number of newspaper reports that seem to suggest that the rules of the Senate are such that any Member can simply place a hold on a nomination and preclude any action. That is not the case. It is a courtesy that has been extended to Members by the leadership, but the leadership can always move ahead if they determine it is an urgent matter. Of course, they try to work it out so Members are willing to have it come up. That is what has happened in this instance.

I particularly express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from

Virginia for his efforts to try to move this matter forward.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Maryland. He is quite accurate in his recitation of the rules of the Senate. This is by tradition. I suggest we not deal too much with what took place in the past on this nomination, but I felt that this RECORD this morning should reflect, for those who are following the nomination, my judgment with regard to the tradition of a Senator seeking a hold.

Again, it is part of that balance of power between the two branches. For example, Senator GRASSLEY, in his case, feels very strongly about the need to protect those individuals who are commonly referred to as whistleblowers. They should be protected. Senator GRASSLEY, after having talked with him many times, recognized the Holbrooke nomination is of importance, but he carefully evaluated his responsibility as one of those leaders in the Senate who have protected the rights of whistleblowers. That is behind us.

Many Senators have worked on this nomination. I express my appreciation again to the leadership and those Senators, particularly the Senator from Delaware.

The facts about this nominee are well known. I have known him personally for a number of years. I have watched his distinguished career, and in the course of the morning, I will add some facts. But I want to yield the floor momentarily to my colleague from Delaware.

The point is that my concern about this nomination and its timeliness is because of the fact that we now have in Kosovo a force under the NATO Command of General Clark, Operation Joint Guardian. While we had hoped that this military operation would have had a smooth operational history, in fact it has encountered many unforeseen problems, problems where our troops and the troops of other nations had to perform all types of diverse duties. Many of these young men and women who are courageously participating in this operation have had no formal training in the military with respect to many of the responsibilities they are now undertaking.

The United Nations, under a force known as United Nations Mission in Kosovo, referred to as UNMIK, has had a very slow start getting organized and into the field to perform duties that are currently being performed by the NATO military.

One of the reasons for working to accelerate the consideration of this nomination is that in knowing Mr. Holbrooke and his forcefulness and his background, he, I believe, is better qualified than anyone else I know of today to take on this important post and to accelerate the functions of the United Nations in this region.

The sooner they get in, the less risk to the men and women of the Armed Forces currently undertaking many missions which they are doing quite

well, despite the fact they have had little or no formalized training in operating civil, local governments in the village of Kosovo. Fortunately, this force is under the command of the NATO Commander, General Clark. General Clark and Ambassador Holbrooke have known each other for many years. They have worked together. They participated in the Dayton accords, for which Ambassador Holbrooke deserves great credit, and I will have further comment on that later.

Also, Ambassadors, when they report for their duties, may be fortunate to have a spouse who is quite interested in those duties and perform as a team. This is going to be an extraordinary husband and wife team of Richard Holbrooke and Kati Marton, his wife. She is a noted authoress. She has roots in central Europe. She is a beautifully educated and cultured woman. I have had the privilege of knowing her for a number of years. They will be an extraordinary team in this important post.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a biography of Richard Holbrooke.

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

RICHARD C. HOLBROOKE

Richard C. Holbrooke was the chief negotiator for the 1995 Dayton Peace Accord, which served to bring peace and an end to human rights abuses in Bosnia, while serving as Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs, from September 1994 to February 1996. Beginning June 1997, Holbrooke served as Special Presidential Envoy for Cyprus, and in 1998 he was Special Presidential Envoy for Kosovo. Prior to becoming Assistant Secretary of State, he was U.S. Ambassador to Germany.

President Carter appointed him in 1977 as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, a post he held until 1981. During his tenure, among other major events, the United States established full diplomatic relations with China. He is the only person ever to hold two regional Assistant Secretary of State posts.

Holbrooke began his governmental career in 1962, joining the Foreign Service immediately after graduating from Brown University. After studying Vietnamese, he was sent to Vietnam and, in the following six years, served in a variety of posts related to Vietnam—first in the Mekong Delta as a provincial representative working on rural development, for the Agency for International Development (AID), and then as a staff assistant to Ambassadors Maxwell Taylor and Henry Cabot Lodge. In 1966 he was reassigned to the White House, working on the Vietnam staff to President Johnson. During 1967–69, he wrote one volume of the Pentagon Papers, served as a special assistant to Undersecretaries of State Nicholas Katzenbach and Elliot Richardson, and was a member of the American Delegation to the Paris Peace Talks on Vietnam, headed successively by Averall Harriman and Henry Cabot Lodge.

Following these assignments Holbrooke spent a year as a fellow at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University. From 1970 to 1972 he was Peace Corps Director in Morocco. In 1972, he took leave from the Foreign Service to become Managing Editor of the quarterly magazine *Foreign Policy*, a po-

sition he held until 1976. During 1974–75 he also served as a consultant to the President's Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy, and was a contributing editor of *Newsweek* magazine's International Edition. In 1976 he coordinated National Security Affairs for the Carter-Mondale presidential campaign.

In 1981 he move to the private sector, forming a consulting firm, Public Strategies, with James A. Johnson. He became a Managing Director at Lehman Brothers in 1985. As a banker and diplomat, he has traveled to over 100 countries, including over 65 trips to China alone. He covered both domestic and foreign clients at Lehman Brothers, working on a wide variety of transactions.

In 1992 he chaired the Bipartisan Commission on Reorganizing the Government for Foreign Policy.

His most recent position in the private sector has been as Vice Chairman of Credit Suisse First Boston Corporation, based in New York.

Holbrooke has had long involvement in the non-governmental organization community. He is current Chairman of Refugees International; Chairman of the American Academy in Berlin; Chairman of the National Advisory Council of the Harriman Institute, and a member of numerous Boards of directors and committees.

Holbrooke adds the Eleanor Roosevelt Val-Kil Medal to a long list of distinguished awards and honorary degrees already received. He is the author of "To End a War," on his Balkan peacemaking experiences, and co-author of *Counsel to the President*, the memoirs of Clark Clifford, as well as numerous articles on foreign policy.

Holbrooke was born on April 24, 1941 in New York. He received a bachelor's degree from Brown University. He has two sons, both television producers. He is married to author Kati Marton and lives in New York.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, that concludes my opening remarks. I may have further remarks about this nominee, but I want to share the time now with my distinguished colleague from Delaware. I yield the floor.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased the Senate is finally considering the nomination of Richard C. Holbrooke to be the United States Representative to the United Nations.

Before stating my reasons why I strongly believe that Ambassador Holbrooke should be confirmed, let me briefly review the process which led us to this day.

In June 1998, the President announced his intention to nominate Ambassador Holbrooke for the job of UN Ambassador. The formal nomination was delayed, however, until February of this year by an investigation into alleged ethical violations by Ambassador Holbrooke.

That investigation culminated in a settlement with the Department of Justice in which Ambassador Holbrooke agreed to pay five thousand dollars in civil penalties.

Once the Senate received the nomination in February, the Committee on Foreign Relations conducted its own inquiry, reviewing in great detail the investigation conducted by the State Department Inspector General and the Department of Justice.

In June, the Committee conducted three separate hearings on Ambassador

Holbrooke's nomination, reviewing first the ethical matters, then reviewing issues related to the United Nations and UN reform, and then reviewing Ambassador Holbrooke's involvement in United States policy toward the Balkans.

On June 30 the Committee voted unanimously—on a voice vote—to report Ambassador Holbrooke's nomination to the full Senate.

Since the Committee reported Mr. Holbrooke's nomination, it has been subjected to a variety of reported "holds" by several senators, only one of which, as I understand it, had anything to do with Mr. Holbrooke's qualifications to be ambassador.

This delay is quite extraordinary for a position of this importance. The last two UN ambassadors were confirmed on the same day that the Committee voted, and in the last two decades, the Senate has, on average, voted within four days of the Committee's vote.

But we have now worked through all those and we are here today, for which I am grateful to the Majority Leader and the Chairman.

I believe the Senate should confirm Ambassador Holbrooke for a simple reason: he is highly qualified for the job.

There are few people who have had the kind of diplomatic experience that Ambassador Holbrooke has had.

Ambassador Holbrooke had been in public service since the early 1960s, when he entered the Foreign Service. Since then, he has served in a wide variety of diplomatic positions—in each case with distinction.

In the Carter Administration, he served as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. Appointed at the age of 37, at the time he was the youngest person ever appointed as assistant secretary.

In 1993, Ambassador Holbrooke returned to government service as Ambassador to Germany.

In September 1994, he became Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs. Again, Ambassador Holbrooke established a precedent: he became the first person to serve as assistant secretary of state for two different geographic regions.

A key challenge facing him upon his return to the United States was the conflict in Bosnia, which by then had been raging since April 1992.

As Assistant Secretary, Mr. Holbrooke helped design and implement a strategy that culminated in the signing of the Dayton Accords in November 1995, which brought an end to the Bosnian war.

Of course, several people in the U.S. government deserve credit for the success at Dayton. But it cannot be denied that Ambassador Holbrooke—and the creativity and tenacity he brought to the task—was critical to bringing about this diplomatic achievement.

In February 1996, for personal reasons, Ambassador Holbrooke resigned from full-time government service. At

the request of Secretary of State Christopher, he remained available to undertake special missions and to advise senior officials in the State Department. In 1997, President Clinton also asked him to become special Presidential envoy for Cyprus.

Throughout the three and one-half year period since leaving full-time government service, Ambassador Holbrooke has never been paid a dime for his efforts.

Mr. President, I daresay that there are few people with the diplomatic experience that Mr. Holbrooke will bring to the job of UN ambassador. He has significant experience at high levels of government. He has deep experience in two regions. And he has recently supervised and managed a major diplomatic conference that culminated in the end of a tragic war.

Let me state it as bluntly as I know how: we need Dick Holbrooke in New York and we need him there now. It has been nearly a year since we have had a UN ambassador.

The agenda facing the next UN ambassador is a long one.

The United Nations is taking the lead in establishing a civilian administration in Kosovo. We need someone with Dick Holbrooke's skill and knowledge to make sure it gets done right.

The United Nations is greatly in need of reform. We have promised the UN that we will pay nearly one billion dollars in back dues if these reforms are made. Ambassador Holbrooke promised that UN reform will be his "highest sustained priority." We need someone with Dick Holbrooke's negotiating skills to help bring them about.

The UN Security Council remains seized with the issue of dismantling Iraq's arsenal of mass destruction. We need someone with Dick Holbrooke's toughness to carry that task forward.

In sum, I believe Ambassador Holbrooke has all the qualities necessary to be an excellent UN ambassador, and I believe that the Senate should confirm him forthwith.

Let me turn briefly to the issues that delayed Mr. Holbrooke's nomination.

Last July, soon after the President announced his intention to nominate Mr. Holbrooke, an anonymous letter arrived in the Office of the Inspector General at the Department of State alleging that Ambassador Holbrooke may have violated ethics laws and regulations.

Spurred by this letter, the Inspector General opened a wide-ranging investigation that took over five months, involved dozens of interviews, and the production of thousands of pages of records.

Earlier this year, while the nomination was pending, the Inspector General opened a second investigation, this time based only on an oped article in the Washington Post.

The first investigation culminated in a civil settlement between Ambassador Holbrooke and the Department of Justice in which Ambassador Holbrooke

agreed to pay five thousand dollars to settle allegations that he violated Section 207(c) of Title 18 of the United States Code.

To this day, Ambassador Holbrooke denies that he violated the law, but he settled the matter in order to avoid further delay of the nomination. The second investigation was closed almost as quickly as it was opened, with no punishment imposed against Ambassador Holbrooke.

The Committee obtained the thousands of pages of documents that were produced in the investigations of Ambassador Holbrooke, and has reviewed them independently.

I have reviewed all these matters closely, and I do not believe that they even begin to rise to the level where they should be considered disqualifying.

I do not make this statement lightly. I am a strong supporter of the ethics laws, and believe they must be rigorously enforced. Government employees, as Ambassador Holbrooke stated in his first hearing before the Committee, must maintain the public trust.

I have known Richard Holbrooke for two decades, and am presumptuous enough to call him a friend. I do not believe that he is an unethical person, and I find totally inconsistent with his character any suggestion that he is.

On the contrary: Dick Holbrooke is a dedicated public servant who, as the record compiled by the Committee demonstrates, willingly devoted dozens—if not hundreds—of hours to assisting the government in the past several years, to the detriment of his commitment to his private employer.

Every senator can be assured that the Committee has left no stone unturned.

The Committee sought and received access to every document reviewed by the investigators, and received access to internal documents of the White House, the Department of State, and the Department of Justice, including the memorandum setting forth the reasons why a criminal prosecution of Mr. Holbrooke was not warranted.

Mr. President, my friend from Virginia is very diplomatic. My friend from Virginia is a man of grace and elegance. My friend from Virginia is a man who is able to get things done not merely because of his intellect but because of his style.

I am not as elegant as my friend from Virginia, so I will just say it out loud. This would not have happened without my friend from Virginia. The truth of the matter is, it took a Republican of stature, seniority, and influence in this area to break this loose. He is going to get mad at my saying this, but I think it is a shame that was required, but I thank him for it because he was relentless over the last 5 months in trying to get us to this point today.

I will ruin his reputation here, but the President owes him a debt of gratitude, the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude, the Senate owes him a debt

of gratitude, and Mr. Holbrooke, I know, is grateful for his effort. Because as the Senator from Virginia indicated, there is a significant agenda facing our next Ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I appreciate his thoughtful remarks, but, again, it was a team effort by a number of us, including the Senator from Delaware.

I want to make the point here, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. HELMS, and Senator BIDEN's colleagues on that committee held a hearing. There was a unanimous vote, and Mr. HELMS reported this nomination to the floor. It did pass through there with the approval of the committee on which the Senator serves.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I never had a doubt, nor did any of my colleagues, that if we ever got any forum in which we could discuss the qualifications of Richard Holbrooke, he would win unanimously. We never doubted that. But it took a lot to get it to the Foreign Relations Committee, to get a vote in the Foreign Relations Committee, and once it got to the floor, to move it forward.

I want to say something about these holds. I have been here 27 years. I have been a sitting Senator longer than the Senator from Virginia. There are only seven people who have been in the entire Senate longer than I. We have lost our sense of proportion. Holds do nothing to do with—nothing to do with—the balance of power here when used in the fashion they were used.

Let me explain what I mean by that. It is one thing to say, I am going to hold up that bill from passing because the bill left out two bridges in my State that are critical to the commerce of my State. There is a correlation between the spending of money and the impact on my State—a sense of proportion.

If I say that I am going to hold up the next Director of NASA because I want answers on how the space program is going to work, that is reasonable. There is a sense of proportion. There is a relationship between NASA and the head of NASA.

But when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee for several years, or were I to become chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I said: By the way—and, by the way, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee did not do this—were I to say: You know, I realize the President's nominee for the Supreme Court may be a good guy, or good woman, but I'm going to hold her up because the Dover Air Force Base is being closed, that is no sense of proportion, that is an abuse of power—an abuse of power. That is totally unreasonable.

Let's get straight what this was about. We held up one of the single most important foreign policy personnel decisions to be made by this administration. And not a person in this

Senate would disagree with that assertion. Why? Because one Senator wanted someone on the Federal Election Commission whom he did not get, and another Senator thought that some second-tier person who worked at the U.S. mission to the U.N., who in fact was disciplined, should not have been disciplined.

The process in the law that calls for review of that person's case is underway. The person who helped write that process into the law decides that the process isn't working quickly enough or getting the result he wants, so they hold up the Ambassador to the United Nations at this moment in our history.

I respect both the gentlemen who did those things personally, but I respectfully suggest—as we Catholics say, when you are a little kid and you go to confession, they say you learn to examine your conscience. Go examine your conscience and tell me whether there is any sense of proportion.

As I stated earlier, since 1981, in the case of nominations for UN ambassador, the average amount of time—the number of days between the time that nominee was reported by the Foreign Relations Committee and the time that that nominee was voted on in the Senate was 4 days—4 days.

The reason I mention this is, you know what I am afraid of? I say to my friend from Virginia and my Republican colleagues. When the Democratic Party takes control, we are going to learn wrong lessons from you all, we are going to learn the wrong lessons.

I remember when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, we had the Clarence Thomas nomination. Before Anita Hill came along we had a vote, and it was 7-7. Guess what. Technically, that means he did not get enough votes to be voted out. I had some very liberal Democrats, hard-edged Democrats, like your hard-right Republicans, say: Mr. Chairman, it's within your power not to report him to the floor.

How responsible would it have been for me, as the chairman of the committee—which I could have done—to prevent the Senate from voting on a Supreme Court nominee? The Republicans would have done that, based on their conduct on this nomination. And guess what. If it happens again, mark my words, Democrats are going to join this place who are going to learn all the wrong lessons from this abuse of power, this lack of proportionality.

I am not going to say any more about it. The reason I am not is that it is done. But I really, truly hope and plead with my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, have a sense of proportion here. We dodged a bullet here because of the incredible work of Senator HELMS and Senator WARNER on the Republican side and the eventual yielding on the part of others. Reason ultimately prevailed. But this is a bad, bad, bad practice; and this is a good, good, good nominee.

I will conclude, because others want to speak, by stressing two points about

Mr. Holbrooke. One, in all my years in the Senate, no one in the Senate who has come before our committee is more qualified to do the job for which he has been nominated than this man—none; not one.

Secondly, this is an ethical man. This man's ethics have been questioned under what I believe to be an aberration. We put in the law—and I voted for inspectors general, but guess what. The law can be triggered by an article in a newspaper. That can hold up a nomination for months and months, requiring intensive investigation. This is the most investigated man we have had for the United Nations, and there is not an unethical drop of blood in this guy's veins.

So I think there are three things we have to do.

Let's put this man in place. Let this incredible energy and intellectual horsepower that this fellow has go to work on behalf of America. Two, let's reexamine whether or not we exercised any proportionality here in holding this up. And three, I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider joining with me and going back and relooking at the way in which the inspector general's office is triggered and worked so we avoid this kind of thing in the future.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. BIDEN. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. If I might just advise my colleagues, the previous order is that the Senate will vote at 10. I ask unanimous consent that that be extended to, say, 10 minutes after 10, to afford other colleagues an opportunity to contribute their remarks. I am sorry, but the leader is very anxious, given the heavy calendar of work today, and I think it is important we proceed to this nomination. So if each of the remaining Senators can take 1 or 2 minutes, that would be helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Yes. I object. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I would like to have up to 5 minutes, and I did not realize I would be shut off.

Mr. WARNER. We will just accommodate the 5 minutes, then. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas have 5 minutes. What are the requests of the other Senators? Two or three minutes? So I ask unanimous consent that we go to the hour of 10:15, at which time we then, hopefully—have the yeas and nays been ordered, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, they have.

Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Richard Holbrooke to be the United

States representative to the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador. Ambassador Holbrooke has rendered superb service to our Nation during the course of his career. His diplomatic experience makes him an ideal choice for this very important position.

We need good, strong leadership at the United Nations. We have been without a permanent representative now for an extended period of time. An able, competent, skillful diplomat can make a big difference in terms of serving the national interests of our country.

Dick Holbrooke has had an illustrious career. He joined the Foreign Service in 1962. He had assignments in Vietnam, where he worked closely with Ambassador William Porter, Ambassador Maxwell Taylor, and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. From the very beginning he was right in the middle of the decisionmaking arena and was recognized for his extraordinary talents. He was the Director of the Peace Corps in Morocco. He then left the Government for a while and was a managing editor of Foreign Policy magazine, one of our leading foreign policy think magazines, where he did an outstanding job. In the mid-1970s, he was senior consultant to the President's Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy.

This is a man who has committed his entire career to analyzing and enhancing the foreign policy of the United States in the name of serving our national security interests. He held two assistant secretaryships within the Department of State: Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs and Assistant Secretary for European and Canadian Affairs. He has also served in a very distinguished way as our Ambassador to Germany.

I have worked closely with him in his capacity as Presidential Special Envoy to Cyprus, where he has striven mightily to try to move that issue forward.

He will do a terrific job at the United Nations. He has done an excellent job in every government position he has held. His commitment and dedication are obvious for all to see. I think the Senator from Delaware was right in saying that there were attacks on Dick Holbrooke's character which were extremely unfortunate and without basis or justification. To his credit, he withstood all of that. A lesser person might have walked away and said: Who needs to put up with this? But he has a driving sense of serving the country and serving the national interest.

Dick Holbrooke has addressed difficult, complex foreign policy issues in an extremely incisive and competent way. We need that skill at the United Nations. That is the skill he will bring. I am relieved that the nomination is finally before us for judgment.

I urge my colleagues to support the nomination of Dick Holbrooke to be our Ambassador to the United Nations. He will serve our Nation and, indeed, the world well in this position.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today we consider the nomination of Richard Holbrooke to the position of United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations. I would say that this debate is long overdue.

The United Nations is a very important tool in America's foreign policy arsenal and our ambassador to the U.N. is the key to unlocking that power. For the past ten months, however, that post has stood vacant, thereby degrading our influence at the U.N. Today we have an opportunity to correct that omission and restore some of the United States' leadership in that world body.

There are few things the United States as a nation holds more dear than the ideals our country was founded on nearly 223 years ago. We continue to lead the global fight for freedom, for democracy, for peace, and for respect for human rights. For the past five decades, it has been the United States' strong, clear and persistent voice in both the Security Council and the General Assembly which has convinced other nations to support those same ideals.

Looking back on those fifty years, it is clear that our work at the United Nations has, by and large, been a success. Today, the United Nations is one of the most powerful champions of human rights, freedom and peace around the world. The U.S. has used the United Nations to support our foreign policy in places as far flung as Korea, Libya, Iraq, and Bosnia.

Without the United Nations, the two suspects in the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 would probably never have faced a judge to account for their actions. Similarly, Saddam Hussein would still be free to terrorize both his neighbors and his own citizens. If it were not for the United Nations sponsored Implementation Force in Bosnia, war, bloodshed and genocide would still rule that nation. Today, the United Nations is engaged in helping to implement certain aspects of the peace settlement in Kosovo—which we all hope and pray will put an end to the bloodshed there as well.

While we are all familiar with United Nations peace keeping efforts in Bosnia and Iraq, we must not forget that men and women wearing the U.N.'s signature blue helmets are keeping the peace in places as disparate as Angola and Tajikistan. In all, there are currently 16 different on-going peace keeping operations on four continents.

As we embark on the next stage of involvement in Kosovo—one in which the United Nations will have an important role—it is tremendously important that we are represented in that world body. We must not allow any additional delay to further erode our leadership.

Last fall, President Clinton tapped an exceedingly qualified diplomat to

head our delegation to the United Nations. Richard Holbrooke has served our nation well in a wide variety of posts—from Assistant Secretary of State for two different regions to Ambassador to Germany.

Today, many of our thoughts are focused on the Balkans and this first real chance to bring peace to Kosovo. It is particularly fitting, therefore, that among Ambassador Holbrooke's greatest achievements are the Dayton Peace Accords which ended the civil war and genocide in Bosnia.

Five years ago, it was the war and ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, not Kosovo, that captured the world's attention. Innocent civilians were murdered and raped simply on the basis of their ethnicity. Venturing into the market to buy food entailed the risk of instant death at the hands of snipers or soldiers with a mortar on a nearby hill-top. Each day was a fight for survival.

Today, however, Bosnia is rebuilding. In 1995, talks held thousands of miles away from the battlefields—in Dayton, Ohio—silenced the sounds of gunfire and ended the massive human rights abuses. The man who brought the Serbs, Bosnians and Croats together for those talks and fought hard to reach a settlement is sitting before us today.

As Ambassador Holbrooke well knows, it is often easier to wage war than to make peace. In spite of the daunting odds, however, Ambassador Holbrooke did make peace and for that he deserves our praise.

Following his return to the private sector in 1996, Ambassador Holbrooke continued to serve his country. Without any compensation from the government, Ambassador Holbrooke focused his efforts on trying to end the dispute on the island of Cyprus and the bloodshed in Kosovo.

The success or failure of the Kosovo agreement it will be determined by whether the United States, our NATO allies and Russia stay the course together. The job of bringing this broad coalition together and keeping it together will not be an easy one, but it is one with which Ambassador Holbrooke has experience—experience we need at the United Nations at this critical juncture.

It is important to mention the other critical issue which is damaging our reputation and effectiveness at the U.N.: our failure to pay our dues. The funds we owe the U.N. are formal treaty obligations, not optional contributions. Today, we are in grave danger of losing our vote in the General Assembly. Imagine the irony if the United States, one of the founders of the United Nations, loses its vote in that organization's primary decision making body. The compromise Chairman HELMS and Senator BIDEN worked out with respect to our dues will go a long way to repairing the damage if we are able to convince our colleagues in the House to refrain from attaching poison pills to this bill. We already missed one

opportunity to pass that compromise, namely the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. I remain hopeful, however, that the compromise, which is a part of the Senate passed State Department Authorization bill and now in conference with the House will become law before the end of this session of Congress.

Now is the right time to confirm a new ambassador to the U.N. He has the requisite experience for the job and, even more importantly, is a proven peacemaker.

Mr. President, in conclusion I add my voice to those who have already spoken expressing their gratitude to Senator HELMS and Senator BIDEN, who are the chair and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, for the leadership that my friend and colleague from Virginia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has shown on this nomination, and for many others who have spoken on behalf of Richard Holbrooke, in many cases, not because they agree with the politics of Richard Holbrooke or necessarily agree with every position he has taken on various public matters, but because there is an understanding that in our country, regardless of administration and politics, we need good, talented people, who analyze issues well and bring an energy and a passion and a commitment to public policy.

For those reasons, I am particularly grateful to our friends on the other side who may not agree with Richard Holbrooke but understand he is a talented human being.

I underscore the point that Senator SARBANES made. Too often we discourage good people in this country from serving their Nation because we have created a gauntlet that one has to go through prior to confirmation that will discourage other people from even thinking about going through this process. What you expose yourself and your family to to take on positions to serve your country is becoming far too much. I think as a body we ought to take a closer look at what we ask people to go through whom we ask to serve their Nation.

Richard Holbrooke has a distinguished career, as Senator SARBANES and Senator WARNER and others have pointed out, going back more than 30 years. He has been through an awful lot over the last year and a half, almost 2 years now.

I particularly am concerned about the inspector general at the State Department, as my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee know. I have written an amendment, which was adopted, that requires that those people in the State Department who are accused of wrongdoing have a right—I know this sounds like a radical thought—to know what they are accused of and have an opportunity to respond to the accusation before the reports are written. That is not the case today.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. Does the Senator mean that at the moment you are not permitted to find out what the charges are and the nature of the accusations?

Mr. DODD. That is absolutely correct. In the case of Richard Holbrooke, he was not allowed to find out what the charges were against him for well over a year. A common criminal accused of a felony in this country has that right. It seems to me if we have a system inside our government where a mere accusation of someone can result in months and months of delay or public retribution, not to mention legal costs to defend yourself, something is terribly wrong with that process. We are trying to correct it.

Again, I don't want to spend the time talking about the problems we have but to commend one individual for persistence, who wants to serve his country, who is going to do, in my view, a remarkably fine job for all of us. I am sorry it took so long for him to arrive at this point, but I am grateful he has. Again, for those who made it possible, I thank them and am confident that Richard Holbrooke will serve our Nation well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I will speak about why I am going to vote against the Holbrooke nomination. I start by saying, I have never put a hold on this nomination. I thought the process should go forward in due course. I think Richard Holbrooke is a principled man. I think he is a committed public servant. I admire his tenacity, his dedication. I have nothing personal against Richard Holbrooke.

I am voting against him because I disagree with the policy that he has put forward in the Balkans. I just can't, in good conscience, vote for someone who I think is taking our country in the wrong direction.

This is his policy: that the United States should spend billions of dollars, wear and tear on our equipment and our troops, stretching our military for a goal that I believe is not achievable.

I would commit our military immediately if I thought the goal and the mission were the correct one, but I believe our policy in the Balkans is to force factions to live together in an American model, when the circumstances are different from any we have ever had in our country. I don't think we can put American requirements into the Balkans with any chance to succeed.

We have had a policy that the United States could use force of vast proportions without strategically assessing what would be more proportional responses in line with our own security threat and our other responsibilities in the world. Richard Holbrooke did not allow the United States, through his

policies, to lift the arms embargo on one faction in Bosnia, so one group was unarmed against two groups that were armed. I think if we had lifted the arms embargo 3 years before the Dayton accords, those people would have had a fair chance. I don't think we would have seen the mass slaughter of the Moslems that we did. I disagree with that policy.

We never looked at the opportunity for self-determination in the Balkans. We never looked at the opportunity to let these people form governments within their ethnic groups. They are 98 percent in ethnic groups now in Bosnia, but we are still trying to force them to have a coalition government. If we walked out today, I think every expert would agree the fighting would continue.

The Washington Post yesterday had a headline, "NATO Losing Kosovo Battle." This was not a headline 2 months ago. It was yesterday.

The reason is, we have a policy in the Balkans that I think is going to hurt our own national security by over-deploying our military troops, by wear and tear on our equipment, by not having a sense of proportion in looking for other options, not looking at all of our commitments in the world, but instead trying to force an American model that I think is unrealistic today.

I think there are other options to try to help the people in the Balkans create stability with self-determination and then, eventually maybe, they would be able to live closer together in harmony.

Mr. President, I want to say I am only voting against Mr. Holbrooke on his foreign policy principles, not on him as a person. I will say again that I think he is a committed public servant. I think he is tenacious in his beliefs, and I admire that in a person. I just believe that our foreign policy is going in the wrong direction in this country. I think we are going to pay a high price for it, and I think Richard Holbrooke is one of the architects of this policy that I believe is quite erroneous. So, for that reason, I will vote against Richard Holbrooke.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I have had a chance to discuss the role of the U.S. at the United Nations with the nominee on a number of occasions and I am confident that the President has nominated the right man for the job. Mr. Holbrooke has a reputation for being a tough negotiator and a practiced arm-twister and those are exactly the attributes we need in our next Ambassador to the United Nations.

It's not going to be easy to get the UN to implement the Helms-Biden package even though there is widespread agreement on the need for reform. I believe Ambassador Holbrooke has the skills necessary to leverage our position as the most powerful nation in the world—and as the largest contributor to the UN—to ensure greater transparency and accountability in

that organization. That is why I have enthusiastically backed the nomination of Mr. Holbrooke and look forward to working with him in the future.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the nomination of Richard Holbrooke to be America's Ambassador to the United Nations, and I am pleased that the Congressional delay in reaching this vote has finally ended.

Richard Holbrooke has a long and distinguished record of public service and is an outstanding diplomat. He clearly has the necessary experience, background, and skills to ably represent America's interests at the United Nations.

Richard Holbrooke has served with great distinction in many previous capacities, and all of us who know him have great respect for his ability and judgement. He has served as the President's Special Envoy to Cyprus, as Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs, as U.S. Ambassador to Germany, as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, and as a Peace Corps Director in Morocco.

Of his many extraordinary accomplishments, he is best known for his skillful work in presiding over the long and difficult negotiations to achieve the Dayton Peace Accords in 1995, which ended the war in Bosnia.

The United Nations is a complex institution involving many international interests, and I'm confident that Richard Holbrooke will represent our country well. Our representative must be an exceptional negotiator. Richard Holbrooke is a skilled negotiator with the ability to articulate clearly our country's ideals and persuade other members of the international community to support these ideals as well. He's an outstanding choice for this very important foreign policy position, and I'm proud to express my strong support.

Mr. SPECTER. I am pleased to vote for the confirmation of Ambassador Richard Holbrooke to be United States Ambassador to the United Nations and even more pleased to see the Senate vote on this important nomination in advance of the August recess so that Ambassador Holbrooke can start on his important assignment.

Ambassador Holbrooke brings unique qualifications to this position. He began his government career in 1962 joining the Foreign Service after graduating from Brown University. Among the many posts he has held are Special Presidential Envoy for Cyprus in 1997, Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Peace Corps Director in Morocco and U.S. Ambassador to Germany. Ambassador Holbrooke was the chief negotiator for the Dayton Peace Accord in Bosnia.

I had occasion to evaluate Ambassador Holbrooke's work in some detail when I served as Chairman of the Intelligence committee which undertook a

detailed investigation of the sale of Iranian arms to Bosnia. Ambassador Holbrooke was involved in a complex, highly sensitive matter and he discharged his duties with professionalism.

In undertaking the complex negotiations on Bosnia, Ambassador Holbrooke again performed a great service for the United States. His last minute negotiations with Yugoslavia's President Milosevic, while unsuccessful, showed his unique talents which will be put to good use for our national interest in his new capacity as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. I believe the Senator from Virginia yielded a couple minutes to me earlier.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut, and also to Senator HAGEL, who has been very helpful in this nomination. At the conclusion of his remarks, the vote will occur.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I first thank those who have finally brought the nomination of Richard Holbrooke to the floor of the Senate, particularly the senior Senator from North Carolina and the senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, who have done yeoman's work here in the national interest.

Secondly, I wanted to say this about the nominee himself, who I have been privileged to come to know. In my opinion, Richard Holbrooke is one of America's great natural resources. Certainly, he is one of our great diplomatic resources. He has had a career that has been described in detail here that puts him at the top ranks of those who have served America in the international arena. He is a person of principle, purpose, intellect, and enormous energy and talent. He combines the sense of American purpose, which, incidentally, is reflected in his work on behalf of the policy of the United States, representing the Commander in Chief of the United States in regard to the Balkans, about which my friend from Texas has just spoken. He combines that sense of American principle and the continuing vitality of America's morality in the world with extraordinary, tough-minded, practical, and interpersonal diplomatic skills.

We are fortunate to have a person of this talent willing to serve our Nation. I am confident that he will advance our national security and principled interests in the United Nations. I am proud to support the nomination.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. HAGEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise to strongly support the nomination of Richard Holbrooke to be this country's Ambassador to the U.N. I was thinking

the other day when we were engaged in the Foreign Relation Committee's fourth hearing on Mr. Holbrooke—four hearings on Mr. Holbrooke. We looked rather closely and thoroughly at his policies, his background, his professional and personal life. He did not come up short in all of those areas. But I was thinking, I don't know if there has been an individual who has been more probed and investigated for this very important position than Mr. Holbrooke.

I have believed for a long time that the President of the United States deserves his team. As he nominates his team for the Senate to pass judgment on, give advice and consent, as constitutionally is our responsibility, if that individual possesses the high moral quality and qualifications, and the high professional standings, qualifications, and experience, then the President needs his team.

I echo much of what has been said this morning about how important it is that we get our Representative of the United Nations. Now, we have differences of opinion in philosophy and policy, and I appreciate that. Every Senator has his or her own position, as it should be. But I will say this as my last comment about Mr. Holbrooke. I hope and I believe he will make every effort to bring some bipartisanship to foreign policy. It seems to me that we have allowed bipartisanship in foreign policy and national security affairs to erode and come undone to the point where it is dangerous.

I believe both sides are responsible. I think the President hasn't reached out enough, and I think we in the Congress have made foreign policy and national security affairs a more brittle, raw political dynamic. If we don't come back together, as bipartisanship needs to be sewn back together in these very important issues for the future of our country and stability of the world, we will pay a high price. I hope that Mr. Holbrooke will lead that effort.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the distinguished Senator. He has been very helpful throughout the nominating process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard Holbrooke, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, and the nomination of Richard Holbrooke, of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, en bloc.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), would vote "aye."

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

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 259 Ex.]

YEAS—81

Abraham	Durbin	McCain
Akaka	Edwards	McConnell
Ashcroft	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Moynihan
Bayh	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Bennett	Frist	Murray
Biden	Gorton	Reed
Bingaman	Graham	Reid
Bond	Grams	Robb
Boxer	Grassley	Rockefeller
Breaux	Hagel	Roth
Brownback	Harkin	Santorum
Bryan	Hatch	Sarbanes
Burns	Hollings	Schumer
Byrd	Inouye	Shelby
Campbell	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Chafee	Johnson	Snowe
Cleland	Kennedy	Specter
Cochran	Kerrey	Stevens
Collins	Kerry	Thomas
Conrad	Kohl	Thompson
Coverdell	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Torricelli
DeWine	Levin	Voinovich
Dodd	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lincoln	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lugar	Wyden

NAYS—16

Allard	Hutchinson	Nickles
Bunning	Hutchison	Roberts
Craig	Inhofe	Sessions
Enzi	Kyl	Smith (NH)
Gramm	Lott	
Gregg	Mack	

NOT VOTING—3

Crapo	Helms	Landrieu
-------	-------	----------

The nominations, en bloc, were confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider is laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Gorton Amendment No. 1359, of a technical nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.