

judges or judicial nominations, when over 90 percent of the President's nominees have already been confirmed, 205 out of 215 total. What is really at stake is something a lot greater, a struggle between a great political tradition in the United States that seeks common ground so we can do the common good, and a new ethic that on any given issue is prepared to use any means to justify the end of absolute victory over whatever and whoever stands in the way of that ethic; a new view that says if you don't like the facts, just change them; if you can't win playing by the rules, just rewrite them; a new view that says if you can't win a debate on the strength of your argument, demonize your opponents; a new view that says it is OK to ignore the overwhelming public interest as long as you can get away with it. For what? For a so-called nuclear option over a few judges, an option that seeks to put extreme, substandard judges on the bench against the will of the American people.

Is it worth undermining our democracy on behalf of Priscilla Owens, who took contributions from Enron and Halliburton and then ruled in their favor? A conflict? Is it worth this distraction from the people's business to confirm a Charles Pickering who fought against implementing the Voting Rights Act and manipulated the judicial system to reduce the sentence of a convicted cross burner? Is it worth throwing out 200 years of Senate tradition to defend William Myers, Janice Rogers Brown, and Bill Pryor whom numerous members of the impartial American Bar Association deemed unqualified?

The fact that we even have to debate a nuclear option over these judges tells you this is all about power, about victory, about a sort of unchallenged ability to be able to do whatever you want, despite the fact that that is not the way it works here and that is not the way our Founding Fathers intended it to work.

It is time to put Americans back in control of their own lives and put Washington back on their side. That means restoring accountability, accountability for false promises, accountability for failure to address issues that we have promised to address, ranging from energy independence to military families who just lose their benefits when they are called to duty and struggle with their families, accountability for fiscal insanity, for record deficits, for mounting debts. That is the debate we owe the American people, accountability for 45 million Americans who have no health care and middle-class Americans who are one doctor's bill away from bankruptcy, especially the 11 million children who have no health care at all. That is what the American people want us to debate with passion, not the rules of the Senate but the legitimacy and the substance of those choices. That is what we ought to do.

Any Senator who has been here for a period of time has watched the decline

of the quality of the exchange between both sides of the aisle in this institution. That is not what this Senate is renown for. It is called the greatest deliberative body in the world, a place where people on both sides can find the common ground and get good things done.

I think Senator McCain has said publicly: We are not always going to be in the majority.

That has been the course of history here. What goes around comes around. That is part of the respect that has always guided this institution. We need to work harder, all of us, to restore what the American people want and haven't had for too long. That is a Washington that works for them.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF JOHN NEGROPONTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about my good friend, John Negroponte. I have known him and Diana and their children—Marina, Alejandra, John, George, and Sophia—for quite some time. I think the Nation is very lucky to have a man of the caliber of John Negroponte on deck, so to speak, and willing to take the assignment of being the new Director of National Intelligence. He has had considerable experience as an ambassador.

I remember full well the first time I met him was in Honduras when he was the Ambassador there. We had a rather severe problem, as people will recall; we called them the Contras. But I got to know him fairly well in the time we were down there. When he returned to Washington, I met his wife and was with him and spent time with him on a family basis. I have spent time with him now in his various positions he has had since that time, at the U.N. and in Iraq.

He is a man of great talent and depth. I believe there are many of us—and I am one of them—who had severe questions about the direction we were taking in terms of this new Director of National Intelligence and how it would relate to existing agencies and to the State Department and to the Department of Defense and to the National Security Agency and all others who are involved in intelligence and relate to those in the Congress who have the oversight responsibility for the intelligence function and for the classified areas of the activities of our Nation.

John Negroponte is a man who can do this job. He is a man of great talent. But more than that, he has demonstrated the ability to work with people and various entities, not only here in our country but throughout the world. This new Director of National Intelligence could well become the most important Cabinet position we have in the years to come. John Negroponte is the man to fashion that

office, to determine what it needs in order to function properly at the beginning, and to set the course for this new intelligence agency.

So I am here to urge that the Senate promptly approve this nomination and confirm John Negroponte so he can start on this very important task.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Alaska concerning the qualifications of John Negroponte. Both the Senator from Alaska and I have known him for many years and his service is one of great distinction. I am confident he will receive the endorsement of an overwhelming majority of the Senate.

NOMINATION OF JOHN BOLTON

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the nomination of John Bolton as ambassador to the United Nations. We all know, somewhat unexpectedly, Mr. Bolton's nomination has been held pending further discussion and consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I want to say I strongly support Mr. Bolton's nomination. He has been confirmed by the Senate four times in the past. He is a smart, experienced, hardworking, and talented man, and he knows the United Nations. He is not a career diplomat, but neither was Jean Kirkpatrick. He is not a career diplomat, either by profession or temperament, but then the role of ambassador to the U.N. has always required something special. A look back at some of the personalities who have held the job—from Adlai Stevenson to Daniel Patrick Moynihan, from Madeleine Albright, to Jean Kirkpatrick, to Richard Holbrooke—shows that directness and forcefulness are assets, not hindrances, to effectiveness there.

We all know Mr. Bolton is perhaps not the world's most beloved manager, nor one to keep his temper entirely under wraps. Perhaps, Mr. President, that evokes a certain sympathy and empathy from this individual, although it is well known that on no occasion have I ever become emotionally involved in anything.

I am sorry about a little levity here.

Seriously, I ask my colleagues is it unique to Mr. Bolton to be strong in his views and opinions? If a temper and an unorthodox management style were disqualifiers from Government service, I would bet a large number of people in Washington would be out of a job.

It is worth wondering not whether Mr. Bolton is a mild, genteel diplomat—we know he is not—but rather whether he is the representative we need at the United Nations. We need an ambassador who truly knows the U.N. We need an ambassador who is willing to shake up an organization that requires serious reform. No one knows better than the Senator from Minnesota, who is in the chair, who has

been heavily involved in the issues of the U.N. We need an ambassador who has the trust of the President and the Secretary of State. Mr. Bolton, it seems to me, has what it takes for the job.

I am reminded, on the judges issue and in this issue, elections do have consequences. I believe there are significant numbers of the American people who do take into consideration the consequences of a Presidential election, and that is the earned right of a President, under anything other than unusual circumstances, to pick his team. There were nominees of the previous Clinton administration I didn't agree with, I would not have selected but because President Clinton was elected President, I voted for his nominees on that basis.

The U.N. is a vital organization to the world and to the national interests of the United States. It is not perfect by any means, and John Bolton knows this. There has been talk that the nomination of Mr. Bolton was an indication of the administration's disdain for multilateral diplomacy. I cannot believe Mr. Bolton wishes to be dispatched for 4 years to an ineffective body, unloved by the United States. I do believe he wants to work actively to reform the U.N., make it stronger and better. Mr. Bolton, seeing clearly the U.N.'s strengths and its weaknesses, will be well positioned to improve the organization and America's relationship with him.

As the Chair well knows, what kind of a U.N. is it that has Libya, Cuba, and Zimbabwe as part of its Human Rights Commission? Is it all right with the U.N. today? We are seeing more and more indications of the Oil-for-Food scandal which, again, the Senator from Minnesota, the Chair, has carefully examined. There is a crying need for reform.

I am pleased the Secretary General of the U.N. has made proposals for reform. I support those and believe perhaps we need more. Again, it seems to me Mr. Bolton sees clearly the strengths and weaknesses, and he would be well positioned to help in this reform effort. Let's not forget that it desperately needs improving. It is hard to take an organization that has countries such as I mentioned that are members of the Human Rights Commission or whose General Assembly equates Zionism with racism. But at the moment, a great opportunity presents itself. The panel named by the Secretary General, on which one of my most respected Americans and beloved Americans, Brent Scowcroft, served, has recently issued its list of recommendations to transform the U.N. Kofi Annan has presented his own serious plan to implement these recommendations.

In other words, I argue that right now the U.N. is in a unique moment, perhaps, in its history; and because of the scandals associated with it, it is open to reform. We need a strong per-

sonality, in my view, and a knowledgeable one to help bring about those reforms.

But without hard work and pressure, nothing will happen. Over the years, the U.N. has proven itself to be remarkably resistant to change. I believe John Bolton could provide the medicine the United Nations needs.

As I mentioned earlier, elections have consequences, and one consequence of President Bush's reelection is he actually should have the right to select officials of his choice. I stress this because the President nominates not the Democrats' selection, nor mine, nor that of any other Senator, but his own choice. I mentioned that when President Clinton was elected, I didn't share the policy views of some of the officials he nominated, but I voted to confirm them, knowing the President has a right to put into place the team he believes will serve him best.

The Foreign Relations Committee is examining whether Mr. Bolton has engaged in truly unacceptable behavior that would disqualify him for office. I believe, unless we see a pattern of inappropriate conduct—which so far I have not—I believe the Senate must move forward expeditiously to confirm John Bolton as America's ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. President, as I criticize some of the activities of the U.N., there are other activities of the U.N. going on as we speak that I think require America's presence. The situation in Darfur, Sudan, for example, is one that cries out for American participation in the decisionmaking process because one could draw a scenario where under extreme circumstances, to prevent genocide, American troops, or certainly American support in the form of logistics and other areas, could be heavily involved, as well as expenditure of American tax dollars, which already constitutes a significant portion of the financing of the United Nations.

So I hope we can set a time and date certain for a vote on Mr. Bolton. As I said, if somebody has information that would disqualify him, that is fine. I don't think he or anybody else deserves a long, drawn-out, exhausting process which damages our ability to participate in the U.N. and also may damage the character of a good man.

I hope we will act as expeditiously as possible. I have great respect for the Foreign Relations Committee and its chairman, Senator LUGAR, all members, and the ranking member, Senator BIDEN. But I certainly hope they realize inordinate delay is not healthy. I, having had the opportunity of knowing Mr. Bolton for many years, believe he would do an outstanding job as our ambassador to the United Nations.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the pending business, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1268) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver's licenses and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Ensign amendment No. 487, to provide for additional border patrol agents for the remainder of fiscal year 2005.

Bayh amendment No. 520, to appropriate an additional \$213,000,000 for Other Procurement, Army, for the procurement of Up-Armored High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (UAHMMWVs).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 15 minutes equally divided. Who yields time?

The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 520

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

In December, just a few months ago, the Secretary of Defense on a visit to Iraq was asked by a soldier why our troops were sent into battle with unarmored vehicles.

It was a question on the minds of many Americans—especially those with sons, daughters, husbands, wives, friends, and neighbors who had answered their country's call and whose lives are on the line every day in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The American people are appalled that our troops have had to fend for themselves by strapping plywood and scrap metal onto their vehicles. Our troops call them "cardboard coffins." As one soldier who served in Iraq said, "I would feel safer in a Volvo than I would in one of these (unarmored) Humvees."

But month after month, the Pentagon has failed to provide enough armored Humvees to meet the urgent security needs of our troops on dangerous patrols in Iraq. On nine different occasions, we have asked the Pentagon for their requirements for armored Humvees, and nine times they have been wrong.

An now the Pentagon actually wants to decrease the production of armored Humvees.

Tell that to our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and they'll let you know how irresponsible that is—just as they told Secretary Rumsfeld on his trip to Iraq in December.