

California. It ends with this reference to the Rice nomination—assertions and allegations about Dr. Rice.

So while I raise my voice on the Senate floor, I hope you will join us on the campaign trail and the loudest message of all, one that all Republicans will not be able to ignore, unseating them in the midterm elections and sending more Democrats to the Senate.

Several times through this letter, it says contribute to the DSCC.

It is fine to have a debate. There should be the concept of advice and consent, but it ought not to be soliciting and politicking. Clearly to be using something as serious as the nomination and confirmation of our Secretary of State to solicit campaign fund is particularly deplorable, especially during our global war on terror when we are trying to get more allies and friends to join with us.

I hope as we get to this vote in about one hour that this sort of political chicanery, political maneuvering and solicitation of funds, and using something as important as this nomination will cease and desist.

I thank you, Mr. President, and my colleagues for allowing me this time to say this.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will rein in this sort of behavior. I don't want to say each and every one of them condones it, but it is deplorable behavior that must cease.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CONDOLEEZZA RICE TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:30 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 4, which the clerk will now report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Condoleezza Rice, of California, to be Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. shall be allocated in the following order: The Senator from Indiana, Mr. LUGAR; the Senator from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN; the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER; the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN; the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID; and the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. FRIST; with the last 5 minutes reserved for the Senator from Indiana or his designee.

The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I have the pleasure and the honor to commend the nomination of Dr. Condoleezza Rice. Soon, the Senate will carry out

its constitutional duty to provide advice and consent on President Bush's nominee for the office of Secretary of State. We will be participants in an historic moment that will reaffirm the Senate's role in foreign policy and underscore the brilliance of the constitutional design.

Last week, the Committee on Foreign Relations held exhaustive hearings on this nomination. Dr. Rice fielded questions on dozens of subjects for more than 10½ hours over 2 days. All 18 members of the Committee took advantage of the opportunity to ask Dr. Rice questions. At the hearings, she responded to 199 questions—129 from Democrats and 70 from Republicans. In addition, in advance of the hearings, members of the Committee submitted 191 detailed questions for the record to Dr. Rice. Members received answers to each of these questions. Thus, Dr. Rice responded to a total of 390 questions from Senators. In American history, few cabinet nominees have provided as much information or answered as many questions during the confirmation process. She demonstrated that her understanding of U.S. foreign policy is comprehensive and insightful.

Our hearings and yesterday's floor action served not only as an examination of Dr. Rice's substantial qualifications, but also as a fundamental debate on the direction of U.S. foreign policy. This debate was useful to the Senate and to the American people. Having the opportunity to question a Secretary of State nominee is a key aspect of Congressional oversight of any administration's foreign policy. Dr. Rice enthusiastically embraced this function of the hearings.

In my judgment she is extraordinarily well-qualified to become Secretary of State. Even Dr. Rice's opponents have taken the time to admire her accomplishments and her qualifications. She is a person of conviction, loyalty, integrity, and ability. As a result of her distinguished service as National Security Advisor to President Bush and her earlier assignments on the NSC, she is well known to many Members of the Senate. We have observed her energy, her expertise, and her devotion to this country. I appreciate the cooperation that she has provided to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to me personally.

I had the good fortune to visit Dr. Rice before she assumed the post of National Security Adviser. Before President George W. Bush was elected, I participated with Dr. Rice at Stanford University meetings on foreign policy hosted by former Secretary of State, George Shultz. Secretary Shultz, a close friend of many in the Senate, was an early supporter of then Governor Bush. He recognized Dr. Rice's prodigious talent and encouraged her leadership within the Bush foreign policy team. At the Stanford University meetings, Dr. Rice demonstrated analytical brilliance and broad knowledge of world affairs. During the 2000 Presi-

dential campaign, she established a trusted relationship with Governor Bush that has carried through in her work as National Security Adviser.

The enormously complex job before Dr. Rice will require all of her talents and experience. American credibility in the world, progress in the war on terrorism, and our relationships with our allies will be greatly affected by the Secretary of State's leadership and the effectiveness of the State Department in the coming years. We recognize the deep personal commitment necessary to undertake this difficult assignment, and we are grateful that a leader of her stature is willing to step forward.

Opponents of the nomination have focused primarily on individual statements made by the nominee during her tenure as National Security Adviser. I simply observe that Dr. Rice has spent 4 years in one of the most intense crucibles of leadership imaginable. The scrutiny that National Security Advisers must live under is unrelenting, and their responsibility for foreign policy outcomes often is exceeded only by the President, who makes the final decision. Dr. Rice has been in the arena making tough decisions and answering tough questions on a daily basis for 4 years. I do not remember any National Security Adviser who did not have bruises to show for stepping into this arena. The attachment of controversies to a National Security Adviser is inevitable. Even as Senators scrutinize Dr. Rice's record, we must not fail to recognize the level of sacrifice, courage, and discipline that is required to be National Security Adviser. Her proven fortitude in meeting these challenges and in sustaining herself physically and mentally through the pressures of responsibility is impressive.

Dr. Rice is not just a survivor. Even under intense pressure, she has performed her duties successfully with thoughtfulness, fairness, and magnanimity. These are exactly the qualities that we want in our top diplomat. And these qualities already have produced results. Dr. Rice has contributed to numerous policy successes in the Bush administration. These successes have involved issues as diverse as our non-proliferation policies, our campaign against global AIDS, and reform of our post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction mechanisms. Befitting the role of National Security Adviser, she has not been in the limelight claiming credit for successes. Instead, she has performed without ego, while preserving the trust of the President. This close relationship will serve her well at the State Department.

The Secretary of State serves as the President's top foreign policy advisor, as our Nation's most visible emissary to the rest of the world, and as manager of one of the most important Departments in our Government. Any one of these jobs would be a challenge for even the most talented public servant. The Secretary of State, at this critical time in our history, must excel in all three roles.

From my own conversations with Dr. Rice, I am confident that she understands that the President's foreign policy can be enhanced in the second term by a closer working relationship with Congress. In moving to head the State Department, she understands that much of this communication will depend on her. Last week's hearings were an excellent start. Her attitude throughout these arduous hearings was always accommodating and always respectful of the Senate's Constitutional role in the nomination process. From the beginning she made clear her desire to have a wide-ranging discussion of U.S. foreign policy and to take all the questions that members wanted to ask.

If confirmed, it will be her duty to use the foundation of these hearings to build a consistent bridge of communication to the Congress. As legislators, we have equal responsibility in this process. We have the responsibility of educating ourselves about national security issues, even when they are not the top issues in headlines or polls. We have the responsibility to maintain good foreign affairs law, even when taking care of this duty yields little credit back home. We have the responsibility to ensure that our first impulse in foreign affairs is one of bipartisanship. And we have the responsibility to speak plainly when we disagree with the administration, but to avoid inflammatory rhetoric that is designed merely to create partisan advantage or settle partisan scores.

We have the opportunity with the beginning of a new presidential term to enhance the constructive role of Congress in foreign policy. We have made an excellent start during the past week. I thank all 19 Senators who participated in the Foreign Relations Committee hearings and all 22 Senators who have joined in the floor debate. I urge Members to vote in favor of the nomination of Dr. Rice to be Secretary of State.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask that the quorum count equally against both sides of the aisle.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: How much time is allotted to the Senator from Delaware on the Rice nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is allotted 20 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to support Dr. Rice's nomination to be Secretary of State. I don't do it as fulsomely as I rose to support the nomination of the previous Secretary of State. I will explain why.

I believe the President of the United States is entitled to his Cabinet unless

the person he selects is so far out of the mainstream, incompetent, clearly of questionable character, or, as some in the past have been, dedicated to the express purpose of dismantling the very agency to which they were being assigned, such as President Reagan—as my mother would say, God love him—who wanted to do away with the Department of Education and assigned two people to be the head of the Department of Education for the express purpose of eliminating an agency that I thought needed to remain, or in the special case when the office calls for an unusually different relation, as the Attorney General does. The Attorney General does not work for the President. He is the people's lawyer. He is hired by the President, but he or she is the people's lawyer and, in the worst of all cases, sometimes required to investigate the President himself and in the best of cases is required to interpret the constitutional laws of the land.

I very reluctantly voted against Attorney General Gonzales's nomination to be Attorney General because I believe he has so wrongly interpreted law on torture and did such great damage as a consequence of that decision. There were significant consequences. There is a fundamentally different relationship and a fundamentally different constitutional obligation. It is his judgment that I question, and I currently believe he should not be Attorney General.

Dr. Rice does not fit in any of those categories. I have known and worked with her for the past 4 years. She is knowledgeable, she is smart, she is honorable, and her relationship with the President is essentially to be the public face of the President of the United States here.

As the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have a special responsibility to work with Dr. Rice, so I am going to vote for Dr. Rice, but I am going to do so with some frustration and reservations. Let me explain why. I have said this to Dr. Rice, so she is not hearing this for the first time.

Last week, we gave Dr. Rice an opportunity to acknowledge the mistakes and misjudgments of the past 4 years. The point is not to play the game "gotcha." It is not about embarrassing the President. It is about learning from our mistakes so we do not repeat them. A second term is also a second chance.

Instead of seizing that opportunity, Dr. Rice stuck to the administration's party line: Always right; never wrong. It is as if acknowledging mistakes or misjudgments is a sign of weakness. I do not think it is. I think it is powerful evidence of strength and maturity.

But during the hearing, Dr. Rice claimed that my colleague, BARBARA BOXER, was impugning her integrity when she asked about her changing rationale for the war in Iraq.

Now, I wish instead that Dr. Rice had acknowledged the facts. This administration secured the support of the

American people, and of Congress, for going to war based on what it insisted was an imminent threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

Now, when it turns out there are no such weapons, Dr. Rice and the President claim the war was now about removing a dictator. I am glad Saddam is gone. He deserves his own special place in hell, but removing him from power was not the justification initially offered by this administration to go to war. Again, it is an example of what BARBARA BOXER was talking about: a changing rationale for war. Why Dr. Rice would not acknowledge that is beyond me.

Reading the resolution that Congress passed giving the President the authority to use force if necessary, it was about "disarming" Saddam. And reread the words of the President and other senior officials. In speech after speech, television appearance after television appearance, they left the American people with the impression that Iraq was on the verge of reconstituting nuclear weapons. In fact, Vice President CHENEY said they already had them.

The administration left the American people with the impression, even today, that Saddam had other weapons of mass destruction, and that he was complicit in the events of 9/11 and that he collaborated with al-Qaida—I assume collaborated with al-Qaida for purposes of the 9/11 attack. Back then the administration liked to claim that President Bush never said Iraq was "an imminent threat." Well, this is what he and other senior officials did say. They referred to it as an "immediate threat," a "mortal threat," an "urgent threat," a "grave threat," a "serious and mounting threat," a "unique threat." And it would be funny, the denial that they did not say "imminent threat" if it were not so deadly serious.

This is my point: Especially in matters of war and peace, we have to level with the American people if we want not only to secure their support but to sustain their support.

My poor colleagues are tired of hearing me say, for the last 2 years, the following: No foreign policy can be sustained without the informed consent of the American people. And this administration has been very reluctant to keep them informed. Informed means all the information and a truthful rendition of the balance of the information they have.

During the time I was criticizing President Bush for his assertions about aluminum tubes and his administration's assertions about other things, the press kept saying to me: Why won't you say the President is a liar? He was not lying. But what the President did—he got the intelligence, as we did on the committee. We can argue whether a minority or a majority, but a significant number of the intelligence assets in the U.S. Government said: We think those aluminum tubes are or could be used for gas centrifuges. A significant number said: No, they are not used for that. They are for artillery.

Well, my criticism of the President was not that he, in fact, chose to believe that portion of the intelligence community which said they were used for gas centrifuge systems, which is needed to build a nuclear capability and if you are going to use uranium; my problem with it was, both he and Dr. Rice implied there was no dissent, that this was the view of the intelligence community, when it was not. There was, at a minimum, a significant dissent both in Energy and at the CIA, and other places. So they did not lie. They chose to pick the portion—I am not saying they did it for any reason other than they believed it, but they chose to pick the portion of the intelligence community's assessment which fit with their objectives, without ever mentioning, acknowledging, or suggesting there was any dissent within the intelligence community.

I love my colleagues now who keep saying: Don't blame it on Rice. Don't blame it on Gonzales. Blame it on the intelligence community. I think our former Director of the CIA is getting a bad rap here.

The fact is, we have to be honest with ourselves and the world; otherwise, we are going to do terrible damage to our most valuable asset, our credibility. After Iraq, it is going to be much harder to rally the world to our side if we have to face a truly imminent threat to our security from, say, Iran or North Korea.

The same goes for the way Dr. Rice answered my questions about training Iraqi security forces. Time and again, this administration has tried to leave the American people with the impression that Iraq has well over 100,000—as high as 120,000; or I think there was even a higher number offered—of fully competent police and military. They don't say fully competent; they say trained.

Now again, it is like that story I have told. We Catholic kids go to Catholic school. We learn to go to one of the Sacraments in the Catholic Church, Penance. You go to confession. They explain to us that when we go to confession, we should confess all our sins. My nuns told me the story about Johnny, who said to the priest: Bless me father for I have sinned. I stole a gold chain. And he failed to tell the priest that attached to that gold chain was an antique gold watch. He did not lie. He stole the chain. But when you say what you did, you should say all of what you did.

Failure to acknowledge, as my grandfather used to say, the "hull" of it, failure to do that is, at a minimum, misleading—at a minimum, misleading. That is what has happened here.

So 120,000 troops trained. There may be 120,000 people who we put uniforms on—and I will not go through it in the limited time I have; I will submit for the RECORD the facts as I believe them based on talking to our military and police trainers—but the real question

is, How many American forces doing the job of policing the streets, going after insurgents, guarding the borders, whatever functions we are now providing, how many of those could be replaced with an Iraqi now? I think the number is closer to somewhere between 4,000 and 18,000.

Now, the good news—when I asked the question, I thought she would say we have made mistakes. We went for quantity not quality. We realize we had to fundamentally change our training programs. We brought in General Petraeus, who is a first-rate guy. He is well underway of doing that—which he is—and we are going to get it right. But, no, we have 120,000 trained forces out there.

Well, the fact is, we are months, if not years, from reaching the target we need of putting uniformed soldiers, uniformed cops, and uniformed National Guard with Iraqi uniforms into Iraq.

The bottom line is, we should focus on real standards, not raw numbers. To my mind, there is a real simple standard. An Iraqi soldier and policeman should be considered fully trained when he or she is capable of doing the job we are now asking an American young man or woman to do. How many meet that standard today? Nowhere near, as I said, 120,000. In my judgment, it is closer to 14,000 total. Army trained is probably closer to 5,000.

So last week's hearing was a chance for Dr. Rice to wipe the slate clean with the American people and with our allies. I wish she had seized it.

This is not about revisiting the past. It is about how Dr. Rice and the administration will meet the challenges of the future.

I notice, in the defense of Dr. Rice, I no longer hear on the floor disagreements—I don't want to get him in trouble—disagreements with the position taken by my friend, the chairman of our committee, or by my friend, Mr. HAGEL, or Mr. MCCAIN, or myself, or others. I do not hear people saying we have conducted this postwar policy very well. I do not hear anybody defending that. They are now saying, which is good: Hey, wait a minute, I guess we have made mistakes.

Why the administration cannot do that is beyond me. They are not up for reelection again. It would seem to me it would be a way to coalesce support.

In my judgment, America faces two overriding national security challenges in this new century. First and foremost, we must win the struggle between freedom and radical Islamic fundamentalism. Secondly, we must keep the world's most dangerous weapons away from its most dangerous people.

On the latter point, the man we owe the greatest debt of gratitude to on making progress on that score is my friend and colleague, Senator LUGAR, and former Senator Nunn. Senator LUGAR is the guy who is following up on this and the guy forcing us all to face the reality that much more is needed to be done.

To prevail, we have to be strong. We also have to be smart, wielding the force of our ideas and ideals together with the force of our arms.

Today, after a necessary war in Afghanistan and an optional war in Iraq, we are rightly confident in the example of our power. But we have forgotten the power of our example.

Foreign policy is not a popularity contest. We must confront hard issues. Sometimes they require us to make hard choices that other countries do not like. But above all, they require American leadership, the kind of persuasion that brings along others to our side.

We have been having a tough time doing just that the past few years. So despite our great military might, in my view, we are more alone in the world than we have been in recent memory. As a result, we are much less secure than we could or should be.

That is because virtually all the threats we face—from terrorism, to the spread of weapons of mass destruction, to rogue states that flout the rules, to endemic and pandemic diseases—cannot be solely met by the unilateral use of force.

I had hoped to hear from Dr. Rice how she planned to help rebuild America's power to persuade, and to restore our Nation's respect that it once enjoyed. For she said, now is the time for diplomacy. Parenthetically, I think diplomacy was needed 4 years ago. I am happy now is the time for diplomacy.

I also had hoped to hear her ideas for contending with a series of problems the administration has put on the back burner but whose pots are boiling over, such as the nuclear programs in North Korea and Iran, the dangerous backsliding of democracy in Russia, and the genocide in Sudan, to only name a few.

Over the past few years, North Korea has increased its nuclear weapons capacity by as much as 400 percent. It may now have as many as eight nuclear weapons to test, hide, or sell to the highest bidder.

Dr. Rice told us it is "unacceptable" for North Korea to have these nuclear weapons, but she did not tell us what that meant or how the administration proposed to stop this growing threat.

Over the past few years, the reform movement in Iran has been crushed and the regime has accelerated its own nuclear program. There may be nothing we can do to persuade Iran not to develop these weapons by diplomacy, but our European allies are trying through a combination of carrots and sticks. They believe they cannot succeed, though, unless the United States engages directly in this effort.

I asked Dr. Rice whether we should be a party to a deal in which the Iranians agreed—if there was a way to verify—that they would stop their attempts to build a nuclear weapon and end their missile program. She said: Well, we have a lot of other problems with Iran.

Of course we do. But our No. 1 problem is the growing danger they will develop nuclear weapons. Our best chance

of stopping that is to work with the Europeans in showing Iran it can get more if it does the right thing, and what it risks if it does not. But we are sitting on the sidelines, in my view. Nothing Dr. Rice said gave me confidence we are really going to get on the playing field.

Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIDEN. Over the past few years, President Putin has reversed the course of democratic development and the rule of law in Russia. The administration has been largely silent. How can we be so concerned about the advancement of democracy in the Middle East and so unconcerned about the regression in Russia?

The President gave a powerful, eloquent inaugural address about expanding freedom around the world. Every American shares that ideal—it goes to who we are as a people, to our experience, and to our interests.

The question isn't the goal, it's how you achieve it. I wonder if the President plans on bringing a signed copy of his address to President Putin when he meets with him next month. I fear that in Russia and many other places, the gap between the administration's rhetoric and the reality of its policies is only going to get wider.

At the same time, we have gotten little in return for turning a blind eye to Russia's regression. One of the most important programs to protect America's security—the effort to help Russia account for, secure and destroy weapons of mass destruction and related materials—has become mired in red tape that the two Presidents need to cut through.

Finally, in Darfur, Sudan we have watched a terrible tragedy unfold. Militia supported by the government have killed as many as 100,000 civilians and chased as many as 2 million from their homes.

Four months ago, before the Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Powell rightly called it genocide. Since then, the situation has gotten even worse. Yet we heard virtually nothing from Dr. Rice about what the administration and Congress can do, now, to stop this slaughter and to help African allies develop their own peacekeeping capacity.

Let me end with something hopeful that Dr. Rice talked about: putting diplomacy back at the center of America's foreign policy.

That effort is long overdue. Be that as it may, I strongly agree with Dr. Rice that this is the time for a new diplomatic offensive with old allies, rising powers, and even hostile regimes.

But our diplomacy has to be sustained. It has to do as much listening as it does talking. And it has to use all the tools at our disposal.

Our military might is critical. It gives credibility to our diplomacy. And it gives us the most powerful tool in

the world to act, if necessary, against dictators who are systematically abusing the rights of their people, or against regimes with no democratic checks that are harboring terrorists and amassing weapons of mass destruction.

But there are many other critical tools that have atrophied under this administration—our intelligence, our public diplomacy, our alliances, international organizations, treaties and agreements, development assistance, trade and investment. We need to wield them with the same determination with which we use force—even if it can be frustrating and even if the payoff takes years, even a generation.

That is what we did after World War II. That is why we prevailed in the Cold War.

Now, faced with a new but no less dangerous set of challenges, we must recapture the totality of America's strength.

Mr. President, I will conclude by suggesting that we are now faced with a new but no less dangerous set of challenges than we were in World War II, and we have to recapture the totality of America's strength.

Above all, we have to understand that those who spread radical Islamic fundamentalism and weapons of mass destruction, although they may be beyond our reach and there is no choice but to confront them and to defeat them, there are still hundreds of millions of hearts and minds around the world who practice Islam who are open to American ideas and ideals, and we have to reach them.

Dr. Rice says she is going to make diplomacy her primary task. I will work with her in that effort.

One of my colleagues said—by the way, I want to note parenthetically that I think it is totally appropriate for Senator DAYTON and Senator KENNEDY and my friend from California to say what they have said, to take the positions they have taken. It is consistent with the facts as they see them. They choose to view one side of the coin. I am viewing the other side of the coin.

One of my colleagues said he is voting his notion that this is going to get worse. I forget the exact phrase my friend from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, used. Well, it reminded me of a comment by Samuel Johnson who described second marriages as the triumph of hope over experience. Well, I may be guilty in this second term of choosing hope over experience, because my experience thus far with this administration on foreign policy has been very disquieting. My hope is that the new—and I suspect she will be; I hope she will be confirmed—the new Secretary of State will, in fact, play a role in trying to change that policy, engage in diplomacy, and use the totality of our strength, which includes our ideas and our ideals, as well as our military power.

I reserve whatever time I may have and thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). Under the previous order, the Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I want to begin today by again thanking Chairman LUGAR and Senator BIDEN, our ranking member, for a very fair debate on the nomination of Dr. Condoleezza Rice as Secretary of State. I know these votes usually go overwhelmingly for the nominee. The last time there was any vote against a nominee, I think the most votes were Kissinger at 7 votes. So I know that what I am doing is not about winning a vote; it is simply about telling the truth as I see it and other Members telling it as they see it.

At the end of the day, when Senators vote, some will be very enthusiastic about the nominee and feel very good about their vote. Others will be a little anxious. I sense with Senator BIDEN, he certainly has anxieties over it, but he is very hopeful. And knowing JOE BIDEN as I do, that definitely fits his character because I think he gave Condoleezza Rice opportunity after opportunity after opportunity to set the record straight, to level with the committee. Senator BIDEN was not on the floor yesterday, but I kind of replayed his give and take with future Secretary Rice on the issue of how many troops were trained, and he was literally begging her to please be candid. It is interesting because after that give and take, which was picked up by the news media, Ambassador Negroponte came into it and said: Clearly, there are not 120,000, but there are more than 4,000.

All this dancing around is not academic because, as Senator BIDEN clearly stated and as we all know, our exit strategy in Iraq is based upon the ability of the Iraqis to defend themselves certainly. We all are working toward that day, but we can't do it if we are not going to be honest about how it is going, and we can't help the administration if they don't level with us as to how things are going.

I found it interesting—and this has nothing to do with this particular nomination—that the White House Chief of Staff called those of us who wanted to debate this “petty.” I saw one clip of him saying that the two Senators—he didn't mention the names—who were trying to get this nomination to the Senate floor and have some time to talk about it were “small.” I don't think he was talking about my height. That is showing such a disrespect to the American people, as we go around the world trying to bring democracy. It is something we all want to do. We may have different ways of going about it, but we want to do it. How do we stand tall if we don't uphold our Constitution? Our Founders believed it was crucial for the Senate to play a strong role in the selection of these very important and powerful positions.

Well, thanks to Senators LUGAR and BIDEN, we have done that. I am glad.

The reason I am going to be voting no is clear to anyone who has followed this debate. I asked Condoleezza Rice a series of questions in five different areas. I gave her every opportunity to correct the record. I asked her about her statements that the aluminum tubes Saddam was buying could only be used for nuclear weapons, and she talked about the mushroom cloud and frightened the American people at a time when we know she had the information that there was a very strong dispute going on in the intelligence community and that, in fact, she had known in 2001 about this issue. She refused to budge.

I asked her about her continual statements that al-Qaida and Saddam were close. It was not true. At the time she made those comments, the State Department itself put out a very important map—this was 1 month after 9/11—saying that in fact there was no al-Qaida whatsoever in Iraq. They were nowhere in Iraq. She refused to budge.

I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 4 minutes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

I asked Dr. Rice about my concerns in five areas. I don't fault the President for picking someone who believes in this war, who helped him in her position. That is not the issue. The issue has to do with the lack of candor that continues to come from Dr. Rice.

As recently as a few months ago she wrote a letter which resulted in a very important amendment in the Intelligence bill being stripped from that bill. This was a bill by Senators MCCAIN and LIEBERMAN, and this provision was written in part by Senator DURBIN. It was an antitorture provision. She opposed it. She wrote that she opposed it. When I asked her about it, she denied that she opposed it, when she had opposed it in writing.

I know there are other Senators coming to the floor of the Senate and saying this argument doesn't hold because she made statements that came from faulty intelligence. If that were the case, I would have no problem with Dr. Rice. Everybody knows there was faulty intelligence. But she continues to put out these misstatements. As a matter of fact, in front of the committee, if one listened closely, she muddled the waters even more. So I gave her the chance to clear it up, and she didn't. That is bad for the Senate. It is bad for the American people.

Dr. King said—and I often repeat it—our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter. This debate mattered. Responsibility matters. Accountability matters. It matters when you give someone a chance to correct the record that is replete with half-truths and misstatements, and they don't take that opportunity.

Dr. Rice is a role model. She is smart. She is intelligent. She is qualified. She is loyal to this President. I

don't question any of that. All of that makes everyone proud. The fact is, it would have been very condescending and inappropriate to have someone as skilled as Dr. Rice before a committee, someone as involved in setting the course of this war as Dr. Rice before the Foreign Relations Committee, and not ask her the kind of questions we all did.

I don't know whether we will have two votes against this nominee or four or seven or eight. I really don't know because I haven't asked one colleague how they are going to vote. This has not been the point of what I have done. I have simply tried to say that holding people accountable is important, that this war matters, that we need to look at the mistakes of the past so we don't repeat them, so we don't send our young people into another war based on hyped-up rhetoric and half-truths.

I thank my colleagues all and again say to my chairman how much I appreciate him. I look forward to moving past this on to the other work of our committee and the other work of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I came to the Senate floor to announce my support for the nomination of Dr. Rice to be our Secretary of State and explained why I thought she was more than qualified to take on this critical position at this critical stage in our Nation's history. In the time and the hours that followed, several of my colleagues came to the floor and announced that they would not support this nomination and explained why. I wanted to return very briefly this morning to simply say that I considered the arguments made against her nomination and they do not alter my conclusion that Dr. Condoleezza Rice is more than qualified to be Secretary of State at this time in our Nation's history.

Some of the criticisms of the administration's policy, particularly post-Saddam in Iraq, I agree with. Others about Dr. Rice personally, I vehemently disagree with. But as I see our role here in advising and consenting, the question is not whether we agree with everything the nominee has ever done or said but whether the nominee is qualified to be Secretary of State. This nominee is more than qualified.

Implicit in this, of course, is that the President has won the right, by virtue of his election, to have around him people who have his confidence. This nominee certainly does.

Secondly, I want to make a statement about how I read the criticisms that have been expressed. They are all about the past, either about past behavior of Dr. Rice or, more particularly, about past administration judgments or actions with regard to foreign policy generally and particularly about the war in Iraq. I want to make clear that I don't hear criticisms about

where we are now or where we should go in the future. It is important that the American people understand that but more important that our friends and foes in Iraq, throughout the Islamic world, and the world generally understand that. There is not substantial dissent in the Senate of the United States about the policy we are following in Iraq today. It is to train the Iraqis to better secure themselves. It is to give them the opportunity, which they will exercise bravely and I believe successfully this Sunday, to elect their own leaders. It is to invest in their own economic well-being so they can create a model within the Arab world of not only a self-governing state but a modernizing state connected to the modern world.

I have listened to my colleagues who oppose this nomination, and I have spoken to them off the floor. I want to make clear to people around the world, there is not a single one of these colleagues who wants us to cut and run from Iraq. There is not a single one of these colleagues who does not fully support our troops there. I want our troops to understand that. There is not a single one of these colleagues who is not supportive of the election this Sunday and hopeful that people will turn out in large numbers. There is no question about which side we are on. We are on the side of the people of Iraq, struggling bravely for a better future, and we are against that minority there, composed largely of leftovers from Saddam Hussein and foreign terrorists associated with al-Qaida, who are killers, murderers, fascists, who want to stop 25 million Iraqis from having a better life.

Finally, if my colleagues believe that Condoleezza Rice is not qualified to be Secretary of State of the United States, then, of course, they must vote against her. But if they are—I hate to use the word "just"—just upset about some of the things this administration has done in Iraq, but if they believe otherwise, that what we are doing now is all we can do to make the situation better, then I appeal to them to vote for Dr. Rice. Give her the benefit of the doubt. In some sense, give the President the benefit of the doubt that I believe the Constitution entitles him. Give America's national interests the benefit of the doubt. Give our soldiers fighting in Iraq the benefit of the doubt.

This nominee has the President's confidence. I want people around the world to know—and I hope with a resounding vote—that though there are disagreements about what the administration has done in regard to our Iraq policy and other elements of foreign policy, that in the final analysis we are together. We are together for what we are pursuing, which is the successful conclusion to our involvement in Iraq and to the spread of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

I thank the Chair and urge a strong vote for Dr. Condoleezza Rice to be our next Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). Who yields time?

Mr. LUGAR. Will the Chair please recognize Senator DOMENICI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank Senator LUGAR for finding time for me to express my views to the Senate and to those who might be listening or viewing the Senate proceedings.

I say to Senator LIEBERMAN, I appreciate very much the broad scope of his statement with reference to America and the world, and I thank him for stating his views, which are my views, and I think the views of an overwhelming number of Senators—77 of them who voted for us to proceed with this approach to Iraq.

I think we all know our intentions, regardless of what some may say, are good and that the objective is that something good happen for the people of Iraq and for America and the world.

Having said that, I have been dismayed to hear—not everyone on the other side—but some use words such as “liar,” to use words as to this nominee—Condoleezza Rice—that called her a liar, implied she was a liar, who implied the President intentionally misled. I would like to zero in on that for a minute and those who have been putting forth that accusation—I am not talking about those who oppose the war. I am talking about those who say the policy was fraught with intentional misleading information about weapons of mass destruction.

I want to step back and say to my fellow Senators and those listening: What if today we were considering for Senate approval Secretary of State Colin Powell? Just think with me. He is the nominee. He is being reconfirmed for Secretary of State. What would the Senators who were here talking about Condoleezza Rice or our President intentionally misleading, being a liar, implying they had information they withheld, what would they say about Colin Powell?

On a certain day, Colin Powell appeared before the United Nations. Remember that day? February 5, 2003. I remember it. I think millions and millions of people remember it: maps, overviews, a firm statement by him about weapons of mass destruction. Now I ask: Where did he get his information? Was he lying? Did he mislead the American people? Was he intentionally trying to force upon us a policy that was not based upon what he said but that those facts were dreamed up? I believe that neither Senators nor the people of America would believe he was not telling the truth.

My point is, he got his information from exactly the same source that our President did, that the Prime Minister of Great Britain did, that all leaders at that point did, that we the Congress did. The President did not get his information from someplace in the sky, nor did Colin Powell. There was only one source: the accumulation of intel-

ligence by the United States intelligence-gathering institutions. They told our President, Condoleezza Rice, and Colin Powell what was going on, and they all said, what? That there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and that Saddam was a danger—an exceptional danger—because he had weapons of mass destruction.

Frankly, I believe there are those who have become partisan on this issue, and I almost would say, and should say, extremely partisan, who have become totally political on this issue and totally personal. There is no evidence whatsoever that Colin Powell lied, that he was misleading us, that Condoleezza Rice was a part of a policy to mislead the American people, nor that the President was. They all had the same information. One would not think that from what we have heard on the floor. One would not think that as you hear those who want to deny her this nomination.

Frankly, that argument does not wash. It is not consistent with reality. It is dreamed up. It is political. It is for no other reason than to insert false and untrue information and facts into this discussion. She deserves the nomination.

The President did not intentionally mislead. Those who oppose the war ought to say it and quit exaggerating and being political and personal about their attacks.

Mr. President, I thank Senator LUGAR, and I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I take very seriously the United States Senate's responsibility to provide advice and consent for the President's nominees. Generally, I believe that the President of the United States should be allowed to have the people he chooses in his cabinet to implement the policies he has been elected to put in place—providing they are qualified to do the job. The vote should not be about the ideology of the nominee—that decision is up to the President—but rather about the nominee's ability to perform the job.

Condoleezza Rice certainly has the academic training and the professional credentials to be Secretary of State. She is bright, articulate, and well versed in diplomatic procedures. She works extremely hard, is dedicated to her job, and is very close to the President. In many respects, she was the natural choice to succeed Secretary Colin Powell.

But, I am afraid there is a showstopper here. As National Security Advisor, Ms. Rice has been one of the most public faces of this administration's policy in Iraq. She has been the public face of this administration's crusade to generate American support for an invasion. In her effort to do this, Ms. Rice has made many of the most categorical statements on Iraq, claiming that we had evidence that Saddam Hussein was pursuing weapons of mass destruction, that Saddam had ties to the al Qaeda terrorists, that we were

threatened by a mushroom cloud from Iraq, or a little vial that Saddam might give to terrorists to poison us. Over and over again, Ms. Rice has used every shred of evidence she could find, even evidence that the CIA urged her to retract, in order to make the case that Iraq was a direct and immediate threat to the United States.

We now know that most of the intelligence information that led the President to conclude Iraq was an immediate threat to the United States was wrong. Not only have no weapons of mass destruction been found in Iraq, but no evidence has surfaced of any recent attempt by Saddam to develop these weapons. No ties with al Qaeda have come to light. Ironically, it now appears that since the U.S. invasion, terrorists groups are enjoying a surge in recruitment and have even set up training camps in Iraq. Hatred of America's actions in Iraq has surged throughout the Muslim world and beyond. Condoleezza Rice is not solely responsible for this dangerous turn of events, but she is inextricably linked to this policy, and refuses to admit that any mistakes have been made by this administration.

A hallmark of the administration's Iraq policy has been a refusal to work with the international community. President Bush preferred to go it alone rather than be hampered by the constraints of the United Nations or make the concessions necessary to form a broad coalition. Ms. Rice was a prime spokesperson for this policy. She repeatedly justified the doctrine of preemption and defended the wisdom of going it alone, even if it meant losing the support of our closest allies. She was the public face of this policy of contempt for the role of diplomacy.

The Secretary of State is America's second most visible face to the world. If he or she is to be effective, the Secretary must be seen as truthful, forthright, and respectful of other nations. The hallmark of this administration's foreign policy has been its willingness to distort information in the service of its political objectives, and its failure to tell the truth. It has viewed other nations as either naive or cowardly if they have disagreed with our policy. Ms. Rice has been the public face of this policy and this “modus operandi”. Nothing could be more detrimental to her ability to be a successful Secretary of State.

I have said all along that this war is wrong, that the administration's rationale for this war was faulty, and that the consequences of this war may be very detrimental to our national interest and our national security. Unfortunately, it looks like these observations are proving correct.

More than 1,370 American soldiers have died in this war, and over 10,000 have been wounded, many of them maimed for life. Countless thousands of Iraqis have died—we will probably never know how many. Their country has been devastated, and as of now, it

appears this Sunday's elections are unlikely to bring about any resolution of the internal strife. Civil war is a real possibility, and today it is hard to see how progress is going to be made toward the administration's goal of stability in Iraq.

Condoleezza Rice has been a lead architect of our Nation's failed foreign policy and of the war in Iraq. Therefore I believe she is severely handicapped in her ability to be America's chief diplomat and the chief architect of America's effort to resolve these problems. This administration has not hesitated to play loose with the truth and show contempt for international opinion. These are not the tools of successful diplomacy, the primary responsibility of the Secretary of State.

Therefore, sadly, for the first time in my Senate career, I must cast my vote against a Cabinet-level nominee. I will vote no on the nomination of Condoleezza Rice to be Secretary of State.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I speak today in response to some things I have heard a few of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say about Dr. Condoleezza Rice. I want to set the record straight and express my full support for her confirmation.

Dr. Rice is without question one of the most qualified people ever to be chosen as Secretary of State. She is more qualified to be Secretary of State than all 100 Senators are for their jobs.

It is not surprising to me that I have not heard any of my colleagues question Dr. Rice's qualifications. She is one of the most well-rounded foreign policy experts in the nation, having spent some 25 years in Government, the private sector, and academics.

In Government, she has served three Presidents, including service at the National Security Council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon. As National Security Advisor, one of the most important foreign policy positions in our Government, she has been a key architect of our Nation's response to terrorism and threats abroad. Since she joined the Bush administration as National Security Advisor, this administration has reached an agreement with Russia to reduce nuclear weapons, successfully achieved the return of our military personnel from China when their plane was taken hostage, engaged North Korea in multilateral talks to end their nuclear weapons program, launched an effort to fight AIDS around the world, and freed millions of people living under the tyranny of Saddam Hussein and the Taliban.

In addition to her Government service, Dr. Rice has spent time in the business world where she gained the management experience needed to run an organization as large and diverse as the State Department. She has served on numerous corporate boards, and was the top budget official at Stanford University when she served as Provost.

While I do not think that academic achievement alone qualifies someone

for a job as important as Secretary of State, there is no question Dr. Rice has proven her intelligence, knowledge, and hard work through her academic career. She has three degrees, including a doctorate, in Government and foreign policy. She has written numerous books and articles on national defense and foreign policy topics. And while serving as Provost at Stanford, she was also the top academic officer of that prestigious university.

Rather than questioning Dr. Rice's qualifications, the few Senators who have come to the floor to speak against her are simply playing politics. I fear the Senators I listened to all day yesterday are acting out of bitterness from the rejection of their ideas and candidates at the polls last fall. They are attacking Dr. Rice in a continuing effort to tear down our great President and to tear down his policies that are bringing freedom and democracy to those who have never experienced it. Worse yet, I fear some of my colleagues are attacking Dr. Rice to paint a false picture of her because they believe she may one day seek elected office, or even be an opponent at the ballot box.

Well, I have no such concerns about Dr. Rice, and I have no problems supporting her. Late last year I had the pleasure to sit down with Dr. Rice and discuss her vision for our foreign policy and the State Department. I was impressed by how clearly she discussed the war on terrorism and our involvement in the Middle East. We are involved in an effort to bring freedom, democracy, and individual rights to a region of the world that has never known any of those things. Dr. Rice understands that those changes will not happen in just a few months or years. It will take decades, if not generations, to see the Middle East transform into a peaceful and stable region. The next few years are critical to that effort, and I believe Dr. Rice is the right person to lead our relations with Middle Eastern nations as well as all nations around the world.

Mr. President, I am confident the Senate will overwhelmingly confirm Dr. Rice, and I wish her well. She has a huge task ahead of her, including bringing accountability to the United Nations and getting to the bottom of the Oil-for-Food scandal, and I hope this body will be responsive to her needs as she works to promote freedom and our national security.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, the vote on whether to confirm Condoleezza Rice as Secretary of State is a difficult decision. The administration and Defense Department's Iraq policy has been, by any reasonable measure, riddled with errors, misstatements, and misjudgments. From the beginning of the Iraqi war, we were inadequately prepared for the aftermath of the invasion with too few troops and an inadequate plan to stabilize Iraq. Today, we are reaping the consequences of those decisions with continuing tragic losses of American

and Iraqi lives, a full-fledged insurgency in Iraq and a lack of security and stability in many areas. In fact, the National Intelligence Council, the CIA's own think tank, recently stated that Iraq has now replaced Afghanistan as the prime international terrorist haven—a deeply disturbing result of our problematic policies.

In her role as National Security Advisor, Dr. Rice was a member of the team responsible for our flawed Iraq policy. She made several misleading statements about the presence of weapons of mass destruction in the lead up to the war. And in the almost 2 years since the Iraq invasion, the flawed policies on Iraq have not been corrected. Indeed, Dr. Rice has tremendous difficulty in even admitting error though obvious errors abound. In addition, \$18 billion has been appropriated for the reconstruction of Iraq, but only a tiny percentage of that money has actually been spent because of the violence in Iraq.

Although I profoundly disagree and deeply regret how this war has been conducted, my concern has less to do with Dr. Rice and more to do with President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, and Secretary Rumsfeld. The fact is that the President was reelected, and, though I was strongly opposed to his reelection, he was reelected nonetheless. I do not believe, however, that accountability ends with an election. We are all public servants, including the President and his team, and we are all therefore accountable to the public for our achievements and mistakes on a continual basis. We are also accountable to the future and to history.

So while I, and many of my colleagues, have strong concerns about her role in the development of a flawed Iraq policy, an overwhelming majority on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including a large majority of committee Democrats, voted in favor of forwarding her nomination to the full Senate. While many of my Democratic colleagues on the committee, including the ranking member, share my concern over her role in our Iraq policy, they think it worthwhile to give her a chance in this new role. That judgment, from Senators who had the opportunity to probe and question Dr. Rice on her qualifications, tips the balance in favor of voting for Dr. Rice's nomination to be Secretary of State, in my mind.

I am hopeful that Dr. Rice's background and training will enable her to serve as Secretary of State with distinction and that she will carry the lessons of our policy failures in Iraq with her as she leads the Department of State. She does have the President's ear and I hope she will use her role to direct the President's attention to addressing our frayed alliances in Europe, our relationships with Latin America, our policy toward Russia, nuclear proliferation around the world, especially in Iran and North Korea, personal sustained attention to new opportunities

for lasting security and peace in the Middle East, problems and opportunities posed by China, Afghanistan, India and Pakistan and to lead the world's efforts to address the global crises of AIDS and other diseases, environmental degradation, poverty, education and health care in the developing world, and human rights.

As National Security Advisor, Dr. Rice's role was to advise the President. The Secretary of State has a different role as the Nation's chief diplomat. Dr. Rice's proposed appointments to senior positions within the State Department are well-qualified experienced personnel.

I am hopeful that Dr. Rice's statements during the recent hearings in support of reaching out to allies, public diplomacy and building coalitions will be more than words, but instead describe a genuine effort to ensure that our country leads the world though its strong alliances, values and example.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am glad that we have had a few more days to consider and hours to discuss this nomination. Some have suggested that we should have simply "voice voted" Dr. Rice's nomination so she could be confirmed in time for the inauguration. Senators are here to advise and consent, not rubber stamp for the White House's convenience.

We needed this extra time for debate. The Secretary of State is the chief foreign policy adviser to the President and fourth in the line of Presidential succession. And, like some other Senators, I was disappointed by Dr. Rice's testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee last week.

I had hoped that her testimony would demonstrate the kind of forthright, objective analysis that I believe we need in a Secretary of State. Unfortunately, it did not. I share the serious concerns expressed by Senator BOXER and Senator KERRY, and I commend them and other Senators for voicing them.

I have not been impressed with Dr. Rice's performance as National Security Adviser. Strong leadership, openness, and sound judgment have been far less evident at the National Security Council during her tenure than I would have liked.

I also believe that she has not always been forthright with Congress or the American people. She contributed to the exaggerated public statements, false information in the President's State of the Union speech about Iraq's supposed attempts to acquire nuclear material, and the selective declassification of intelligence, which helped to create an atmosphere of hysteria that led us into war in Iraq. She and others created the false—the false—impression that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States.

These were serious failures, made worse by Dr. Rice's unwavering advocacy and support for the administration's policies that have cost the lives of over 1,300 American soldiers and an estimated 100,000 Iraqis, many of them noncombatants.

It has alienated our friends and allies and convinced many of the world's Muslims that we are at war with Islam itself. It led to the atrocities at Abu Ghraib. It has added \$200 billion to the Federal deficit and at the rate we are going that is only a down payment.

There are now 150,000 American troops, many of them National Guard and Reserve, bogged down in an unwinnable war in Iraq that has become a haven for terrorists.

Yet Dr. Rice refuses to own up to the Administration's failures. When confronted with her own glaringly inconsistent statements regarding weapons of mass destruction which were the primary justification for the war, she responded that the question unfairly impugned her integrity.

She had an opportunity to reassure her detractors, and believe me there are many in my State of Vermont, when she testified last week. She declined to do so, and that was disappointing and frustrating to those of us who want her to succeed in her new position.

My vote in favor of Dr. Rice is difficult to explain. It is more the product of a belief than a cold analysis of her record. I believe that Dr. Rice is capable of learning from her mistakes and changing her ways. That she will rise to this new challenge. That she can be a good Secretary of State.

The other major reason I am voting in favor of Dr. Rice's nomination is that I am the ranking member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. In this capacity, I have a responsibility to work with the Secretary of State, on a daily basis, to tackle a full range of international issues critical to the United States and the rest of the world: AIDS and other global health issues, human rights, the United Nations, terrorism, the environment, women's rights, poverty, corruption, to name just a few.

By voting for Dr. Rice's nomination, I am sending a clear message: I want to get this important working relationship started on the right track. I hope that my vote will be a step towards a more constructive U.S. foreign policy. After all, it is these policies that ultimately impact the lives of billions of people around the world.

During the first term, the Bush administration dug a deep hole: relationships with our oldest allies are badly strained, Iraq is a mess, and our own country is badly divided.

We need to come together as a Nation to deal with these and many other problems. But coming together does not mean ignoring valid criticism, embarking on a policy that pleases only one side of the aisle, and accusing those opposed of being un-American or unpatriotic. Criticism and dissent are the essence of democracy, the essence of patriotism.

Coming together means genuine consultations with members of both political parties, and policies which reflect a range of views even if they do not fit into preconceived ideologies.

As I said, I hope that my vote here today will, in some small way, help begin this process. I hope it will allow us to get back to the real practice of the Vandenberg rule—that politics end at the water's edge—and away from the slash and burn politics practiced during the first term of the Bush administration.

I hope that Dr. Rice will meet me half way. I want to work with her on the many pressing issues that concern both Democrats and Republicans, including the issues of freedom and human rights that the President spoke of in his inaugural address that are so important not only to Americans, but to people everywhere.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of Dr. Condoleezza Rice to be our next Secretary of State. I am pleased to echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues—Dr. Rice's accomplishments are inspirational, and she sets an amazing role model for young people in our Nation today.

We are considering a person for Secretary of State with an impressive educational resume, a person who has lived through some of the most trying eras of our history and who represents the best of America. Dr. Condoleezza Rice is more than well qualified to be Secretary of State. She served 6 years as the Provost of Stanford University. Under President George H. W. Bush, she was Director and Senior Director of Soviet and East European Affairs in the National Security Council, and a Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

With her experience the last 4 years as National Security Adviser to President Bush, she comes prepared for this position like no other person could. She knows our President and his foreign policy and national security issues. She will arrive at a new job with a full understanding of the President's plan for our chief diplomat.

I have had the privilege of working with Dr. Rice during her tenure as National Security Adviser. In 2001, Dr. Rice played an instrumental role in the Senate's passage of S. 149, the Export Administration Act of 2001, a bill I introduced in 2000. S. 149 was a strong bill that would have modernized our national export control system for dual-use items and technology. The bill, which required a risk-based analysis of proposed exports and emphasized transparency and accountability, garnered vocal support from the President, the Secretaries of Defense and State, and our National Security Adviser, Dr. Condoleezza Rice. The support of Dr. Rice underscored the strength of the bill's national security provisions. Unfortunately, Congress failed to pass S. 149 into law before adjourning the 106th Congress.

As such, I look forward to working again with Dr. Rice in her new capacity as Secretary of State on issues related to export controls. In her new role, I believe she will be a leader within the interagency process on dual-use

exports, as well as an effective leader for the Office of Defense Trade Controls, ODTC, which administers the International Traffic in Arms Regulations, ITAR, and maintains the munitions list—a list of items controlled for defense purposes. Dr. Rice's experience on the National Security Council has well prepared her for a job that will require a fair and realistic approach to controlling both defense and dual-use exports.

We must ensure that our export control system keeps sensitive items and technology out of the hands of the terrorists and other bad actors. At the same time, we must also make sure our troops and allies, who are fighting every day for freedom and democracy, have access to the best and most technologically advanced tools of our time. This will take forward thinking from all the Departments responsible for controlling defense and dual-use items, including the Department of State. Our export control policy must take into consideration the fact that the U.S. military and private high-tech companies are codependent. Private companies are pushing the technological envelope for both militarily critical and civilian products. And we must work toward a system that allows these companies to continue growing and developing so as not to stifle the military's rate of technological advancement. I believe Dr. Rice will provide an intelligent and knowledgeable voice in this endeavor.

I have been disappointed with the comments made by some of my colleagues. While we all certainly have the right and duty to disagree on policy and procedures, the nature of some comments have gone beyond what is appropriate for this body. I strongly believe the character of Dr. Rice and her integrity are above reproach. The criticism heard here, unfortunately, reaches beyond the Senate and far beyond Washington.

I remind my colleagues that when we speak on the Senate floor, our words are heard by brave men and women serving overseas. Our words are heard by their families and their friends who make it possible for them to serve our Nation so well. I hope we all remember that as we debate the merits of our foreign policy and the nomination of Dr. Rice.

I am pleased to again state my support for the nomination of Dr. Rice. Her experience, her dedication, her integrity, and her character will make her a good representative of our Nation.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have serious reservations about the nomination of Condoleezza Rice for Secretary of State.

While I believe that the President deserves the opportunity to select his own team in the construction of his Cabinet, the confirmation process is one which gives the U.S. Senate the opportunity to reject a selection that it feels would not be in the best interest of our country.

The nomination of National Security Advisor Rice to become Secretary of State has been troubling to me because she was a part of the dispensing of intelligence information to justify the war in Iraq. That intelligence turned out to be fundamentally wrong.

There is no question that Ms. Rice has the intellect, the academic background, and the work history to justify this nomination. She is extraordinarily talented and skilled. But even so, I have significant reservations about her role in the use of intelligence leading up to the Iraq war.

I recognize she was working for and representing the President, the Vice President, and others in the administration, but nonetheless she too must bear responsibility for some very significant mistakes.

I sought out Condoleezza Rice yesterday for a personal conversation about a number of the issues that concerned me. We had a full and lengthy discussion about those matters, especially the use of intelligence leading up to the war.

I've decided after much reflection that I will cast a vote for her confirmation, but it is a close call for me. I fervently hope that this administration, including the President and the new Secretary of State, will rethink some of the foreign policy initiatives that I believe have made our country less secure—not more secure.

So I will cast a yes vote with reservations and hope that this administration has learned from the serious mistakes in foreign policy it has made in its first term.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, today we are considering the nomination of Condoleezza Rice to be Secretary of State. Dr. Rice is professionally competent and accomplished. Her academic background is impressive and she has the diplomatic skills necessary to serve as Secretary of State. I intend to vote in favor of her nomination, but not without expressing serious reservations and concerns. This administration's first term was marked by a series of failures and miscalculations that have cost this country dearly. Dr. Rice, as National Security Adviser, must bear some of the responsibility for these mistakes. Now, however, she also has an opportunity to correct them. I will therefore cast this vote with the hope and expectation that she will work with the Congress to forge a new approach to our foreign policy.

Dr. Rice's tasks, if she is eventually confirmed, are numerous and daunting.

The administration should be rapidly expanding efforts to stop the proliferation of nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union and throughout the world. The prospect of these materials in the hands of terrorists is truly the greatest risk to our national security. Mobilizing our allies in a concerted and coordinated effort to stop Iran's nuclear program must also be at the top of the new Secretary's agenda.

Additionally, the administration must finally engage with the rest of

the world in addressing global climate change. Almost every day, new scientific evidence raises the world's concern and challenges our fate.

The administration should also expand efforts to combat HIV/AIDS to include India and other second-tier countries. Thus far, its words have been right, but the financial reality has fallen short.

We should fully fund our development and disaster assistance accounts and finally meet the promises of the Millennium Challenge Account.

The administration, working with our allies, needs to broaden nation-building efforts in Afghanistan so that warlords and narcotics do not destroy the hope of Afghan democracy.

And it must confront human rights abusers, not just in the "outposts of tyranny" mentioned by Dr. Rice in her testimony to the Foreign Relations Committee, but in Saudi Arabia, China, Central Asia and throughout the world.

And, we must address these and many other challenges with a new commitment to our alliances. For 50 years, American leadership helped build international institutions to fight common threats and promote the common good. We drafted treaties to articulate universal values and entrench them in international law. And we constructed great military alliances to protect not just ourselves but our friends overseas. With a renewed commitment to alliance building and real engagement around the world, we can begin to end our own current isolation, rescue the reputation of U.S. policy overseas, and bring the resources of our friends and allies to bear on the global challenges we all face.

While Dr. Rice will face many challenges ahead, I intend to speak in detail today on two topics: Iraq and Darfur.

The administration's approach to Iraq has been disastrous from the start. The intelligence used by the administration on weapons of mass destruction and links to al Qaeda were flat wrong. We must begin to learn the lesson of this colossal failure and ensure that we have accurate, objective intelligence. I have and will continue to call for a full accounting of the development and use of the intelligence that led us into Iraq. But in the coming years, I also expect our Secretary of State to join in demanding real intelligence reform. Without it, we will be unable to stabilize Iraq or confront other current and future threats. Our foreign policy must be based on an understanding of our enemies. And our policies and the intelligence behind them must be credible with our friends.

The Administration's approach to the war in Iraq was disastrously unilateral. It ignored the weapons inspectors, rejected our allies, and ended up isolating America. The result of these policies is now borne by our troops, who are fighting nearly alone in Iraq, and by American taxpayers, who are

paying 90 percent of the costs of the war. We cannot afford to continue in this vein. I hope that, in this second term, the administration will recognize the heavy costs of unilateralism and place a priority on diplomacy and alliances. With Iraqi elections less than a week away, the new Secretary of State can begin by acknowledging that ballots do not equal democracy, and that the hard work of stabilizing Iraq will require a concerted global effort. Intellectual honesty is a must for this administration and for our Secretary of State.

There have been a series of miscalculations with regard to almost every aspect of the occupation. The administration failed to commit sufficient troops. It did not consider the political, military and economic challenges inherent in occupying a foreign country. It anticipated neither an insurgency nor sectarian and ethnic conflict. It permitted looting and chaos, when order was so critical. It failed to raise an Iraqi security force before the insurgency was already raging. And its confused policies regarding detention and interrogation led to the abuses at Abu Ghraib. On the international stage and in Iraq itself, the damage caused by these mistakes must be addressed head on. Trust must be rebuilt, through candor and through real changes in policy.

Another great challenge facing the new Secretary of State is Darfur. Secretary of State Powell's declaration of September 9, 2004 that genocide was occurring was appropriate, and I applauded the administration at the time. But having made that declaration, we cannot allow genocide to continue. Nor is the reluctance of other nations to take a tougher position an excuse for inaction. In her testimony to the Foreign Relations Committee, Dr. Rice stated that the reason the U.N. Security Council resolutions on Darfur have been so weak was because other members of the Council opposed sanctions against Khartoum. While this is true, it is time to put real pressure on those countries. Hundreds of thousands of lives are at stake in Darfur. We cannot accept business as usual at the U.N. If our bilateral relations with countries that oppose action to stop the genocide suffer, then that is how it should be. Saving lives, stopping genocide is the high ground. It is a moral imperative.

But through principled and sustained leadership, we have an opportunity to find common ground with our allies and partners. Next week, a U.N. Commission is expected to identify those in Sudan responsible for crimes against humanity. This is the time for accountability. All parties need to put aside their own agendas and do what is right for the sake of stopping this genocide, and deterring future crimes against humanity. Those countries who have opposed sanctions against Sudan need to accept the findings of the Commission and change course. And the ad-

ministration should be open to all forms of justice and accountability, including the International Criminal Court.

This week, the United Nations General Assembly is holding a special session to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi death camps. This session is convening in the spirit of "never again." Soon we have the names of those committing genocide, brought to us by a U.N. Commission established thanks to pressure from the United States. We must not allow ideology to stand in the way of accountability. Referring this case to the ICC will not threaten any Americans. Rather, it will push the ICC toward the purpose for which it was created and affirm America's leadership with regard to universal values of justice and accountability.

Finally, on Darfur, we must push harder for the full deployment of African Union troops. Dr. Rice testified that only a third of a 3,300 person AU force is currently in Darfur. It has been more than 4 months since the U.N. Security Council called for the "rapid expansion" of the AU force. Congress has appropriated \$75 million specifically for this expansion. Getting those troops in place immediately and providing them with all the resources they need to succeed must be a top priority for the new Secretary of State.

And if they succeed, this success will ripple outward across Africa. Having stopped a genocide, visionary African leaders will be positioned to address future crises on the continent and the AU will have taken an important step forward as a credible and forceful institution.

Darfur represents an opportunity for this administration to live up to the words articulated by the President in his inaugural address.

The President said, "All who live in tyranny and hopelessness can know: the United States will not ignore your oppression, or excuse your oppressors." How, then, can we stand by in the face of genocide?

The President, quoting Abraham Lincoln, said, "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it." With the names of those responsible for the killing in Darfur, are we not obligated to see justice served?

And the President, speaking to our allies, said, "We honor your friendship, we rely on your counsel, and we depend on your help." When the African Union expresses a desire to deploy an effective force in Darfur, how can we not do everything in our power to make sure that they succeed?

The challenges ahead are many. And this administration, in its first term, has made many mistakes. But the collective wisdom of America is great. Our new Secretary of State and the rest of the Administration's national security team can, if it chooses, work together with Congress and forge a new ap-

proach—one that will make us safer and create a better world.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the pending nomination of Condoleezza Rice to be Secretary of State. First, I start off by commending the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senators LUGAR and BIDEN, for their efforts to ensure that all members had the time to engage Dr. Rice and to express their thoughts on this very important nomination. I would also like to thank Dr. Rice for her willingness to devote as much time as necessary to answer our questions.

Unlike many other confirmation hearings for Secretary of State, the nominee before us is well known to Congress and to the American people. She has a distinguished record as an academic and has served in many important positions as a public servant. Clearly, she has the requisite skills and experience for this post.

Rightly, the focus of last Tuesday's and Wednesday's committee hearings concerned in great part her role as the President's National Security Advisor in the first term and her vision of what our foreign policy should be in the second term. It is no secret that many of us on the committee have had our differences with the Bush administration's foreign policy agenda during these past 4 years. Nonetheless, I had hoped that the hearings with Dr. Rice would demonstrate that she had grown somewhat intellectually and would be prepared to be more analytical about the strengths and weaknesses of U.S. policy over the past, 4 years. Sadly that has not been the case.

Instead, I have come away with the impression that when it comes to our foreign policy agenda, it is likely that we can expect more of the same when it comes to policy priorities. As well, I have every reason to believe following these interactions that the lack of transparency and accountability which was the hallmark of this administration in the first term will continue into the foreseeable future. These flaws have led the United States to have a negative image both domestically and abroad.

It now appears that little will change in that regard.

For example, Dr. Rice's comments, or lack thereof, on the issue of torture were startling to this Senator, as I presume they were to many of my colleagues. I asked her a simple question, whether or not she felt that on the issue of certain interrogation techniques such as water boarding, forced nudity, and the use of stress positions are tantamount to torture. I asked her to consider this not in the context of whether or not members of al-Qaida are covered by the Geneva Conventions but as a human being reflecting on the actions of one person against another. My question was straightforward; however, Dr. Rice's answer was anything but. In fact, at no point did she provide

a clear answer to the question I posed. Disturbingly, her lack of a clear answer implies that she neither defines these methods as torture nor opposes their use in the war on terror.

International laws and treaties exist for the protection of all parties. They contribute to security and to a more humane world. Agreements such as the Geneva Convention project to the world the values we hold so dear in America, liberty, freedom, the rule of law. We are better intrinsically for abiding by them, and we are better off—Americans are safer—when we successfully protect the values they enshrine.

After all, following World War II, our Nation insisted on trying Nazi war criminals, people who were guilty of the most heinous crimes ever committed against humanity.

We insisted on this because we understood the importance of the rule of law, of being better than the enemy, and that this was the most effective way to spread our values, our common cause against tyranny. Of all the memories I hold dear, I am proud of none more than that of the role my father played as a prosecutor at those trials in Nuremberg.

Dr. Rice chose not to answer my simple question. She had a chance to speak to the whole world yesterday and today to convey the message as to how she will address this issue. I think she is off to a poor start. And I would recommend, for the sake of our national security and American citizens globally that she should reflect upon this subject matter when she assumes her duties as Secretary of State.

I am also troubled by her unwillingness to admit that there were any mistakes made by the Bush administration with respect to the preparation for the war and its aftermath. Even after all the deaths and instability that have plagued Iraq since the U.S. invasion of 2003, Dr. Rice does not appear to have any second thoughts about decisions taken with respect to Iraq. Surely, mistakes have been made. But Dr. Rice appears inclined to follow in the President's footsteps of not being willing to admit mistakes. She was reluctant to admit even the most glaring mistake, that Iraq did not possess WMD, even though that was the fundamental rationale behind the Bush administration's original drive to go to war.

In addition, it was painfully obvious that Dr. Rice does not currently have much of a feel for policy in the Western Hemisphere. With respect to Venezuela, she seems determined to pursue the same path that has done nothing to further democracy, and which has instead made it easy for President Hugo Chavez to vilify the United States. With respect to Cuba, she seems stuck in a 40-year-old fixation on a 78-year-old man, a mode of thought that is outdated, counterintuitive, and ultimately has proven itself unsuccessful. Our inane policy toward that island nation is exemplified by the fact that it is the

only country in the entire world to which the U.S. Government prevents its citizens from traveling. Americans can travel to Iran and North Korea, two nations that are unarguably more threatening, but not to Cuba. Yet, Dr. Rice seems intent on retaining these failed policies.

I also took note of her refusal to provide a straight answer to questions she was asked regarding a recent article about U.S. plans for military action against Iran, which was written by the respected journalist Seymour Hersh and published in the most recent edition of the *New Yorker* magazine. Dr. Rice contended that the article was full of inaccuracies. However, the question put to her by Senator KERRY was quite specific, is the article's contention about U.S. plans with respect to Iran true or false. That is a simple question with a one word answer. If that particular part of the article is inaccurate, it would have been easy and painless to say so. Her lack of candor did not appear to have anything to do with the information being classified. Had that been the case, Dr. Rice could simply have responded that any information regarding the matter would have to be discussed in a classified briefing. But she did not.

All of these issues I have discussed are troubling to say the least. They raise very serious concerns about the direction our foreign policy will take over the next 4 years. Nonetheless, I believe that except in extraordinary circumstances, the President has the right to choose his or her Secretary of State. Therefore it is with serious reservations that I voted to report this nomination favorably to the full Senate and will support her confirmation when the full Senate votes on this matter. However, I would offer some words of advice to Dr. Rice. First, that she reflect upon some of the issues and concerns raised during her confirmation hearings. And second, that she never forget as Secretary of State that she is not just the President's representative, she is the representative of the American people. She should never forget that.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, President Bush made an excellent choice in nominating Dr. Condoleezza Rice to be America's next Secretary of State. She has both the professional experience and the personal integrity to make a great Secretary of State.

I cannot think of a candidate more qualified to be Secretary of State than Condoleezza Rice. Dr. Rice's experience and expertise are truly multi-faceted. She is a distinguished public servant and has led one of our country's most distinguished universities. She has 25 years of experience in foreign policy, having served three Presidents as a key advisor.

She has led the President's national security team with strength and expertise. A short list of her many accomplishments include developing six-party talks aimed at ending North Ko-

rea's nuclear program, helping to design the President's landmark emergency AIDS relief package, and strengthening relations with Russia and China. In her capacity as National Security Advisor, Dr. Rice has developed personal working relationships with international leaders and governments that will enable her to nurture alliances and conduct effective diplomacy around the world. She was instrumental in developing the administration's response to 9/11 and a new framework for United States policy in the Middle East.

Most important, Condoleezza Rice has the trust and confidence of the President. She has served the President as a loyal and trusted advisor. When she speaks to foreign leaders as Secretary of State, they will know that Dr. Rice is speaking on behalf of the President.

I have had the honor of working closely with Dr. Rice on many occasions over the past 4 years. In particular, Dr. Rice's support was extremely helpful to me and to my colleague Senator LIEBERMAN as we undertook the Herculean task of reforming our intelligence community in the last Congress. Dr. Rice helped us overcome the obstacles we faced to ensure the bill became law, and for that, she has my gratitude.

Having a strong foreign policy vision is critical to success in the war on terrorism. Condoleezza Rice is the right person for the job. Dr. Rice will make an outstanding Secretary of State, and I look forward to working with her in the coming years.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I will be casting my vote in support of the nomination of Dr. Condoleezza Rice as our next Secretary of State. Dr. Rice currently serves as President Bush's National Security Advisor. In that position, she has earned the trust and the confidence of the President. Her stellar credentials and her remarkable success story, despite the barriers of segregation in Birmingham, AL, are an inspiration.

Dr. Rice will assume the job of our Nation's top diplomat not only during a time of war but also during a time in which the United States faces countless other challenges. In short, Dr. Rice will have her work cut out for her. As she noted in her opening statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "We must use American diplomacy to help create a balance of power in the world that favors freedom. And the time for diplomacy is now." Indeed. The extent to which we have alienated our allies and aroused suspicion about our policies is breathtaking in contrast to the tremendous support and sympathy we experienced in the aftermath of 9/11. Even as we pour hundreds of billions of dollars into our efforts in the Middle East, there is much that needs to be done to win the war of ideas in the Muslim world and beyond.

There are many lofty ideals which the President extolled in his inaugural

address—democracy and freedom, liberty for all—these are ideals we all share. Our Secretary of State must recognize, however, that ideals are meaningless if they do not inform the specifics of our policies. Where we must work to find common ground is in how to realize these ideals. I look forward to working with the next Secretary of State as we craft the State Department's budget and as we strive for a foreign policy we can all embrace.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today on the nomination of Dr. Condoleezza Rice to serve as Secretary of State.

I have three criteria I use to evaluate all executive branch nominees: competence, integrity and commitment to the core mission of the Department. On the basis of those criteria, I will vote to confirm Dr. Rice.

Yet I do have concerns. This vote is not an endorsement of President Bush's foreign and defense policy as we saw it during Dr. Rice's tenure as National Security Advisor.

I have serious concerns with the way we went to war with Iraq: With the overblown assertions of the threat to the United States; with the deeply flawed intelligence analysis from a few biased sources presented as facts; with the failure to build a strong international coalition; with the failure to prepare and send sufficient forces to deal with the aftermath of removing Saddam from power; and with the failure to prepare by providing our own troops the protective equipment they needed to carry out their missions and come home safe.

I know a lot of the responsibility for those failures rests with the Secretary of Defense.

I hope that Dr. Rice's service as Secretary of State will be historic not only because she will be the first African American woman to hold that office. I hope that Dr. Rice will make history by exercising true leadership at the State Department: Rebuilding our tattered international relationships and alliances; seeking to achieve lasting peace in the Middle East and other conflicts; mobilizing the world to meet humanitarian and development needs; and serving as an effective CEO of the State Department to ensure that our dedicated public servants have safe embassies and the resources they need to effectively formulate policy and represent the United States around the world.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today is a very sad day when we hear that we lost somewhere around 37 or 38 of our finest in the Marine Corps with the crash of a helicopter and additional deaths from the ground fight.

Like everyone here, this information is very painful to me. I have had the experience, as most of my colleagues have, to visit with families as their sons and daughters are buried as a result of their exposure in Afghanistan and Iraq in the military.

Most recently, about 2 weeks ago, I went to a funeral in New Jersey for a

19-year-old marine corporal. I sat with the family who was very proud of their son's contribution to his country. Twin brothers, young men were making comments at the funeral, participating in the eulogy, and the parents, grief stricken about the loss of this wonderful, apparently, young man. I did not know him, but the history of his short years was resplendent with good accomplishments in school.

I mention that because it sets the tone for my feelings about how we portray this war to the American public.

I am a veteran of a war a long time ago. As a matter of fact, I think I am one of three remaining here from World War II. The experiences are, though such a long time ago, still vivid in my mind. I remember the enthusiasm of my friends in high school—I was 18 when I enlisted in the Army—and those in the community and how spirited the support was for everything we did.

I do not see any failing of support for our troops in the theater. We are ready to do whatever we have to to make sure they have the materiel they need. On a visit I made in March of this past year with four other Senators, it was distressful to learn, as we visited with the young people who were doing the fighting there, that they did not have everything they needed. I talked with a small group from New Jersey—eight enlisted personnel and one young captain. I asked if there was anything they needed to conduct their service that would help them.

They were reluctant to complain, but finally this young captain stood up and said: Senator, the flack vest you are wearing is the best that money can buy. I see these vests on some members of the coalition, but we don't have them, Senator, and I would like to ask why.

He said further: When one of our humvees is hit with a rocket grenade or other weapon, very often they will go up in flames, like a firecracker.

He talked about a rifle that was issued to some of the other troops and how much more reliable it was, how much lighter it was, how much easier it was to carry.

I was very upset at hearing that news because the last thing that any of our soldiers should have to do is worry about whether they have the best equipment or whether their lives are going to be protected.

I went to visit at Walter Reed Hospital and saw a fellow who was banged up a little bit. His companion friend with whom he had been injured in Iraq said: You know, if we had not had the new vests, my friend here would have been dead. But he had one of those new vests, and it really helped. He is alive and recovering.

When I saw that families, in many instances, sent gifts of an article or funds to buy a vest that would protect their loved ones, privately raised money to send a vest for a soldier that we sent over there to fight for our views, and

we can't provide the equipment? That set a tone for me, and I must say that many questions arose in my mind as to whether the information we were getting was credible information about all of these commitments that were being talked about from the administration about how we were going to do everything we could to protect our troops. It was not true. No, it was not true.

We did not have enough soldiers over there to do the job starting early in this campaign. We have been reminded on this floor a dozen times that General Shinseki, Chief of the Army, said we needed 300,000 troops to do this job. And, instead, we skinned it on down and sent 130,000. They could not protect themselves. The cost was a horrible cost. Lots of young ones died. And now over 1,400 have died as a result of the effort in Iraq and Afghanistan, over 40 people from the State of New Jersey. I care about those. I am sure all of our colleagues care about the casualties that we have suffered in this war. One cannot be indifferent to a reminder that we are deep in the mud and we do not know when our troops are coming home and we do not know how many more we are going to lose before this endeavor is over.

So for me, the question centers around the information supply that we had: How did we make so many mistakes about weapons of mass destruction? How did we make so many mistakes about how we were going to be treated when we got there? How did we make so many mistakes when it was said we would be there for a short stay, that we would turn this job over to the Iraqis and they would take care of it and we would get out of there in time?

It was not true. No, it was not true. Unfortunately, when Dr. Condoleezza Rice's credentials were presented it was quite a review, quite a hearing, in the committee of jurisdiction. When they tried to find out more about how she would be acting as the Secretary of State, the Foreign Relations Committee did their job very well.

I do not question her extensive and impressive experience in academia and foreign policy. What I question today is her judgment and her ability to be candid with the American people and the Congress about critical information. No, those are not the things we question. What we question is the attention being given to detail. What we question is the attention being given to the commentary that arose in that committee.

During her confirmation, she had many opportunities to reflect on early decisions that were made in statements on Iraq in her position as National Security Adviser to the President, but when Dr. Rice was confronted with her misstatements and inaccuracies she refused to acknowledge any errors or take responsibility. I found that very disappointing.

During her hearing, Dr. Rice was given a chance to correct the record about what she said about Iraq being a

nuclear threat to the United States. Prior to the war, Dr. Rice stated that the smoking gun in Iraq could come in the form of a mushroom cloud. What an assertion that is, a mushroom cloud. That means a nuclear bomb. It means perhaps millions being killed. There was this specter of that kind of damage, that kind of catastrophe, because there were weapons of mass destruction in play there that were available to Saddam Hussein, but we know the evidence to that effect was not there.

In January 2004, the U.S. chief weapons inspector David Kay announced his group found no evidence that Iraq had stockpiled any weapons of mass destruction before our invasion. In October 2004, less than 6 months ago, the Duelfer report was released and contradicted the administration's prewar contention that Iraq had a strong WMD, weapons of mass destruction, program. The Duelfer report's conclusions are so definitive they compelled the administration to announce earlier this month that the search for WMD had officially ended.

Despite all of that information, Dr. Rice refused to admit at her hearing that she made serious mistakes in continuously overstating Iraq's nuclear capabilities. At her hearing, Dr. Rice was also given the chance to speak honestly about the current size of Iraq's security forces. She said that 120,000 Iraqis have been trained so far, but a much more accurate on-the-ground assessment reveals that only 4,000 have been trained. Imagine, on the one hand Dr. Rice said 120,000 Iraqis have been trained and we are trying to get out of there and what we need is a force that is able and large enough and trained well enough so we can bring our kids home, reunite our families.

Four thousand have been trained. We are so far away from having that force ready to take over that no one can tell what the timeframe might be.

When I was in Iraq, I went to a training facility for police officers. About every 6 weeks they graduated 80 officers, and we needed 53,000. So that meant, using the 6-week factor and calculating that by 10, we might be training 800 of these police officers a year, and we need 53,000. Yet we cannot now even find the truth out about what it is that is required.

Dr. Rice also could not explain or at least she would not explain to the committee what our exit strategy is or should be for Iraq. Here she simply chose not to answer the question at all. With more than 1,400 of our brave young men and women in uniform killed, including 48 with ties to my home State of New Jersey, I believe we deserved an answer. Instead, Dr. Rice chose silence.

When it comes to Iraq, unfortunately this administration has lost its credibility with the American people and with the global community, and it is the job of the Secretary of State to restore our credibility abroad, especially

with our allies. In my view, promoting Dr. Rice to the position of Secretary of State puts a stamp of approval on the administration's policies and actions, and I cannot, in good faith, go along with that. Despite ample opportunity, Dr. Rice has shown no inclination to be more forthright about any of the mistakes she and this administration made and continue to make in Iraq or indicate that any change in course might be necessary. I find that very troubling.

Therefore, I feel compelled to vote against her confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides at this stage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 14 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Delaware has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LUGAR. There is 14 minutes and 1 minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, my understanding is the majority leader is en route to the floor. He had responsibilities in the House of Representatives for a period of time. The distinguished Democratic leader is on the floor. It is his desire to wait until the majority leader is present, and both, as I understand, will make final comments, if necessary using leader time. Therefore, Mr. President, I will speak at this point, utilizing the time allotted to our side with a final argument.

Mr. President, I appreciated, as did the Senator from New Mexico, the comments of our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, when he discussed really the long debate we have had with regard to the conduct of the war in Iraq, of the conduct of the war against terrorism, which involves Iraq. Clearly, Senator LIEBERMAN is accurate when he points out that essentially we have had many disagreements about the prewar planning, the problems of the dislocation of all of the Iraqi security forces, the great dilemmas we have had as we approach now the elections and the fledgling democracy we hope Iraqis will be able to fashion as they formulate a constitution and elect the officials of their country.

The security situation remains extremely precarious for American troops and those who are with us in Iraq attempting to help Iraqis provide security for their villages and for their countryside. There are clearly differences of opinion as to how well all of these activities have been conducted, but I think, in recognition of how very difficult it has been for decision-makers, a general consensus is that the batting average has been good, even if not perfect. But Senator LIEBERMAN made the point that now, at this particular moment, as we vote today to confirm a Secretary of State, we are a united group in this Senate on the need for success in Iraq.

There should be no doubt on the part of all who are about to cast their ballots in Iraq and take the chances that are posed when they are threatened really with loss of life for their willingness to exercise a franchise, it should be clear we are united back here.

This is not a fractious group, I hope, today that gives any sustenance of hope to the insurgents, to those who are attempting to formulate disaster in the Middle East that the face of America is not a united face.

I make this point because the person we are about to confirm as Secretary of State will be, aside from the President of the United States, the most prominent spokesperson, the most prominent diplomat making the case for the United States of America and for each of us on this Senate floor as proud Americans. And it is very important, now that we have had a full discussion of arguments on deficiencies, things we must do better, institutions we must improve, simply to note how important it is to the world to have confidence we know what we are doing and that we are prepared at least to continually discuss this in the same candid way we have done, but then to come together and say this is our President, this is our Secretary of State, this is our policy.

I am very hopeful that the vote for Dr. Rice will be a very strong vote. I do not depreciate for a moment the right or desire of those who may have a heartfelt need to say no. That is a great privilege we all exercise. But a lot is at stake today in saying yes, and saying yes together in as large a number as we can muster when the roll is called is important because this is a person who will be Secretary of State, and this is a vote that will be memorable. It is not in any way a trivial pursuit or time of fractious odds or a time to be spoilers. This is for our country at a time to be the very best we can be as Senators.

I have reiterated the record of our hearings and I have appreciated very much the cooperation and, beyond that, the friendship of the distinguished ranking member, Senator BIDEN, because the both of us have shared from time to time with witnesses who have come before our committee considerable anxieties about the policies they were pursuing or some they were not pursuing, or questions we were raising we felt they perhaps had not been raising and that they should. By my best count, in the last 2 years, we have had 23 hearings on Iraq. That is a lot of quality time devoted by good administration witnesses and other experts, as well as by Senators, as I mentioned, in the long hearings we had with Dr. Rice, and in the almost 200 questions raised before the hearing and another 200 during the hearing. This is a lot of questioning, a lot of information, a big record. So we took this seriously, all 18 of us, plus Senator FEINSTEIN of California, who introduced Dr. Rice to the committee

to begin with. Senators have taken it very seriously on the floor.

In my opening comments, I mentioned that at least 22 Senators spoke yesterday and many spoke at length, with very sincere tributes to Dr. Rice. Some of the Senators had very sincere questions about where we are going and what we ought to be doing. But those preliminaries are over. We come now to the moment of decision, and I hope and pray that the vote will be a strong one for a candidate who in fact can be a champion for us. Her entire life story, which has been touched upon, but only barely—and perhaps this is a tribute to our next Secretary of State, that we did not dwell on biography, although it is a dramatic one out of Birmingham, AL. We did not dwell on racial background or on the fact that a lady is going to be Secretary of State. We did not get into many of the divisive arguments we often have as to where somebody comes from and what their background is.

Dr. Rice was taken seriously from the beginning of the hearings and throughout this debate as a world statesperson who knows a great deal, who is extraordinarily intelligent and dedicated to this country and extraordinarily courageous in speaking out as she has.

I add all this simply to say that I am hopeful Senators will vote for Dr. Rice when we vote soon.

I will yield the floor in the hopes that our leader and the distinguished minority leader will have an opportunity to make comments before the Chair calls for the roll.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute of leader time to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I don't speak for those who are going to vote no today. But I think the irony here is that their no vote is a demonstration of how clearly we are united on one point: We want to win in Iraq.

The reason they are voting no is they believe Dr. Rice has misled, in many ways, and as a consequence undermined our ability to succeed. I choose to believe and take the opposite view. But I want to make it clear that those who say no today are actually doing a service to the Senate and possibly making it less likely that the Secretary of State will be less candid with us, or not as candid as she has been in the past. I think the no votes are likely to encourage candor, because that is what it is about. They are voting no in large part because they think she has not been candid and has undermined our ability to succeed.

I look forward to working with Dr. Rice. I suspect there will be an overwhelming vote. Please don't read a no vote as not being united in the effort to win in Iraq. That is why some of my colleagues are voting no; they think

she has undermined our ability to win in Iraq. I choose to differ with them, but we do not differ on the point that we need to succeed in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, is all time used or yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, the Chair has noted we have 5 minutes. We are hopeful of seeing our leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, he is here. He is waiting for my remarks to conclude.

Mr. LUGAR. I will yield back our time and then the leaders may proceed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator LUGAR and Senator BIDEN set a great example for the rest of the Senate in the way they handled this most important issue before this body and the way they handled that committee in general. I admire and respect both of them.

But I do say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, I listened closely yesterday to the remarks and I read some of them today. The remarks yesterday were troubling to me because most all of the remarks yesterday criticized us—that is, the minority—for having this debate, saying why didn't we complete the debate last Thursday when the President was inaugurated.

The philosopher Voltaire once said, "I may disagree with what you have to say, but I shall defend, to the death, your right to say it." Every American who goes to school has seen that quote because it reflects our most deeply cherished values and beliefs. Americans believe in freedom of expression. We believe in democracy. We believe in debate. That is why I have been disappointed that the administration and most of the Republicans in this body have attempted to stifle debate on the nomination of Condoleezza Rice to be Secretary of State. This job, this Cabinet office, is the most powerful and important position in this or any administration. In my years in the Senate, I have studied our rules and procedures, and I have studied them closely. I have come to know them pretty well.

In my years on this Earth, I have studied the qualities and values that I believe will help us become better people. One of those is fairness—basic fairness. I have tried to uphold that value the best I can. So between my knowledge of the Senate rules and my belief in the importance of fairness, I know that we should be debating this nomination. It is our job in the Senate to debate matters of importance to the American people.

We are a deliberative body. We are the Senate of the United States. Our Founding Fathers meant for us to carefully consider the matters brought before us and make sure that our Government does not act irrationally and without a plan and a vision for this

country's future. It is a matter of fairness that those who have concerns about Dr. Rice be allowed to express them. Silence is not an important part of American history, but debate is. "Shut up and vote" is not democracy. It is especially important that we hold debate on Dr. Rice's nomination because of the importance of the job for which she is being considered.

Our Secretary of State will be handling our foreign policy at a time when we are at war and when our friendships and traditional allies have been strained. In Iraq and Afghanistan and around the world, Americans face enormous threats and challenges every day. About 1,400 Americans have died so far in Iraq, and more than 10,000 have been wounded, many grievously wounded. Today, 31 Marines died in 1 incident in Iraq. An estimated 40 troops have died in the last 2 days.

The American people have questions and should have questions, and have concerns and should have concerns, about our plan in Iraq. Those questions deserve answers and those concerns deserve to be addressed. That is what the Senate should be doing. That is what we are all about—asking questions on behalf of the American people. Instead, people such as the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from California have been criticized for not rubberstamping this nomination. I don't think that is appropriate.

Nothing will matter more to the safety and security of our country than our foreign policy decisions over the next few years. If any nominee deserves scrutiny and rigorous debate, it is the nominee for Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice.

Democrats have had 4 hours of debate on Condoleezza Rice—4 hours of debate on the most important Cabinet nomination the President, or any President, can have. Can anyone say that 4 hours of debate dealing with Condoleezza Rice for Secretary of State of the United States is too much? The American people all take longer to buy a car than what we have debated on this nomination. If you want to buy a TV set, you look around Circuit City and other places, and it takes 4 hours. Shouldn't we be able to spend 4 hours on a decision of this magnitude? I think so.

Republicans say a 4-hour debate has been a burden to the country and has been unreasonable. On the contrary, it is exactly what the Founding Fathers contemplated with the advise and consent clause of our Constitution. Debate—vigorous debate—is an American principle of democracy, a principle that is in our national interest, our national security interest and, of course, our foreign policy interests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in 2 or 3 minutes, we will have a historic vote in the Senate Chamber. We are about to confirm Dr. Condoleezza Rice, the first African-American woman to become

Secretary of State. It is a proud moment for this Senate and indeed for the American people. Dr. Rice has served her country with distinction and she has served her country with honor. She has been a steady and a trusted confidant to two Presidents, and as Secretary of State she will apply her long experience and extraordinary skill to meet the greatest challenges of our time—fighting the war on terror and advancing democracy around the globe.

Dr. Rice possesses this rare combination of management and administrative experience, policy expertise, academic scholarship and, not least important, personal integrity and character. Yes, I am disappointed that Dr. Rice's nomination was caught up in partisan politics. While I recognize my colleagues' right to debate the President's nominees, Dr. Rice's obvious qualifications have never, ever been in doubt. Nor was it ever in doubt that a large bipartisan majority would vote to confirm her, which we will see in a few moments. Partisanship has its time and place, but we are at this point in time a nation at war. We need the strength of all of our resources to fight and win. I am disappointed that others on the other side of the aisle have taken this moment to wage a partisan campaign. But it is time for all of us to move on, and we indeed will move forward with this vote.

I look forward to working with Dr. Rice to meet those challenges ahead and I congratulate her on a historic achievement.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mr. FRIST. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Condoleezza Rice, of California, to be Secretary of State?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent. The Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) would have voted "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas, 85, nays, 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 2 Ex.]

YEAS—85

Alexander	Bunning	Coleman
Allard	Burr	Collins
Allen	Cantwell	Conrad
Baucus	Carper	Cornyn
Bennett	Chafee	Corzine
Biden	Chambliss	Craig
Bingaman	Clinton	Crapo
Bond	Coburn	DeMint
Brownback	Cochran	DeWine

Dodd	Landrieu	Santorum
Dole	Leahy	Sarbanes
Domenici	Lieberman	Schumer
Dorgan	Lincoln	Sessions
Ensign	Lott	Shelby
Enzi	Lugar	Smith
Feingold	Martinez	Snowe
Feinstein	McCain	Specter
Frist	McConnell	Stabenow
Graham	Mikulski	Stevens
Grassley	Murkowski	Sununu
Hagel	Murray	Talent
Hatch	Nelson (FL)	Thomas
Hutchison	Nelson (NE)	Thune
Inhofe	Obama	Vitter
Inouye	Pryor	Voinovich
Isakson	Reid	Warner
Johnson	Roberts	Wyden
Kohl	Rockefeller	
Kyl	Salazar	

NAYS—13

Akaka	Durbin	Lautenberg
Bayh	Harkin	Levin
Boxer	Jeffords	Reed
Byrd	Kennedy	
Dayton	Kerry	

NOT VOTING—2

Burns

Gregg

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we have just had a historic vote in the Senate. By an overwhelming bipartisan majority, 85 to 13, the Senate has voted to confirm Dr. Condoleezza Rice, the first African-American woman to become Secretary of State. It is a proud moment for the Senate and for the American people.

For the information of our colleagues, under our previous agreement we will proceed with Secretary-designate Nicholson. We have a short time agreement. Then we will have a voice vote, followed by Secretary-designate Leavitt. Then, shortly after that, I am hopeful we can proceed with Secretary-designate Bodman.

There have been no requests for rollcall votes on any of those three. If that is the case, we would not expect to have rollcall votes later today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Under the previous order, the President will be notified that the nominee has been confirmed.

NOMINATION JIM NICHOLSON TO BE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 5, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jim Nicholson, of Colorado, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes equally divided between the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I have been joined by my colleague, Senator AKAKA, the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to comment briefly on the President's nomination of Ambassador Jim Nicholson to serve as Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Nicholson is a man of considerable character and accomplishment. I

am pleased to speak in support of his nomination to serve in this critical post. I am pleased the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, a committee of which I am the newly elected chairman, approved this nomination Monday at the committee's initial meeting of the 109th Congress.

The President has asked Jim Nicholson to accept one of the more difficult jobs in Washington; that is, running the Department of Veterans Affairs. In the best of times this is a tough assignment. In times like the ones we are now entering, times within which the rate of the growth of the VA's budget will likely slow, but also within which the needs of the service members returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, must and will be met, is a tougher assignment, still. I am highly confident, however, that the President has found the right person for this job.

Let me summarize Jim Nicholson's background. He was born in 1938 to modest circumstances on a farm in Iowa. He left that farm in 1957 to attend the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. After graduation in 1961, he served for 8 years in active service in the Army. He was a ranger and a paratrooper and served a tour in Vietnam from 1965 through 1966 where he earned, among other declarations, the Bronze Star, the Combat Infantryman's badge, the Air Medal, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry.

After returning from Vietnam in 1966, then-Captain Nicholson continued to serve on Active Duty for more than 4 years, followed by an additional 22 years as a Reserve officer. He retired from the Army Reserve in 1991 at the rank of colonel.

While in Active and Reserve service, Mr. Nicholson obtained two advanced degrees, a BA in public policy from Columbia University and a JD from the University of Denver. After practicing law for a relatively brief period in Denver in the 1970s, he launched a very successful real estate development career. Among other positions, he served as chairman and president of Renaissance Homes of Colorado. His business career was also marked with extensive community and charitable activity.

In 1986, Jim Nicholson became a committeeman for the Republican Party's national committee. In 1993, he was elected the Republican National Committee's vice chairman, and then he was elected for a 4-year term as chairman of the Republican National Committee. It was during these years at the helm of the RNC, I grew to know and admire Jim Nicholson. His accomplishments since that time have only increased my respect for the man.

In August of 2001, President Bush appointed Mr. Nicholson U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See, the Vatican. From that post he has advocated for religious reconciliation, for religious freedom in China and Russia, and against the international exploitation and enslavement of defenseless persons, commonly referred to as human trafficking.