

of Honor winner from Hawaii who used to sit right here; and from a college professor turned proud prairie populist and Senate Pied Piper who was taken from us far too soon and far too quickly. From every Member of the Senate, there are characteristics, passions, quirks, and beliefs that bring this place alive and unite to make it the most extraordinary legislative body on Earth. That is what I love about the Senate.

I love that instead of fighting against each other, Bill Frist, the former Republican leader, and I were able to join forces to fight HIV and AIDS around the globe and to convince an unlikely conservative named Jesse Helms to support and pass a bill unanimously that saved millions of lives on our planet. That is what makes this place so special.

Instead of ignoring a freshman Senator, Chairman Claiborne Pell allowed me to pass my very first amendment to change our policy on the Philippines. So I found myself with Dick Lugar, paired as Senate election observers who helped expose the voter fraud of the Marcos regime, ending a dictatorship and giving a nation of more than 90 million people the opportunity to know democracy again. That is what the Senate can do, and that is what I love about it.

Instead of focusing on our different accents and opposite ideologies, Jesse Helms and I found that our concern for illegal drugs was greater than any political differences between us. So Jesse made it possible for an investigation to proceed and for the Senate to expose the linkages between the Contras in Nicaragua and the flow of drugs to American cities. That is what the Senate can do.

The Senate can still work if we learn from and listen to each other—two responsibilities that are, like Webster said about liberty and union, one and inseparable.

So as I offer my final words on the Senate floor, I remember that I came of age in a Senate where freshman Senators didn't speak that often. Senators no longer hold their tongues through whole sessions of Congress, and they shouldn't. Their voices are just as valuable and their votes count just as much as the most tenured Member of this body. But being heard by others does not exempt them from listening to others.

I came to the National Mall in 1971 with fellow veterans who wanted only to talk to our leaders about the war. President Nixon tried to kick us off The Mall. We knocked on door after door on Capitol Hill but too often couldn't get an audience of representatives. A precious few, including Ted Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey, came to where we were camped out and heard what we had to say. I saw firsthand that our political process works only when leaders are willing to listen to each other but also to everyone else. That is how I first came to the Senate—not with my vote but with my

voice—and that is why the end of my tenure here is in many ways a bookend.

Forty-two years ago, I testified before Senator Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee about the realities of war in Vietnam. It wasn't until last week that I would sit before that committee again, this time testifying in my own confirmation hearing. It completed a circle which I never could have imagined drawing but one our Founders surely did. That a citizen voicing his opinion about a matter of personal and national consequence could one day use that voice as a Senator, as the chairman of that same committee before which he had once testified as a private citizen, and then as the President's nominee for Secretary of State, that is a fitting representation of what we mean when we talk about a government "of the people, for the people, and by the people."

In the decades between then and now, this is what I have learned above all else: The privilege of being here is in being able to listen to your constituents. It is the people and their voices much more than the marble buildings and the inimitable institutions they house that determine whether our democracy works.

In my first appearance before the Senate, at the Fulbright hearings, I began by saying, "I am not here as John Kerry. I am here as one member of the group of 1,000, which is a small representation of a very much larger group."

I feel much the same way today as I leave. We are still symbols, representatives of the people who have given us the honor to speak and advocate and vote in their name, and that, as the Bible says, is a "charge to keep." One day, the 99 other Senators who continue on for now—and soon to be 100 again in a few days—will also leave in their own turn—in your own turn—some by their own choosing and some by the people's. Our time here is not meant to last forever. If we use the time to posture politically in Washington, we weaken our position across the world. If democracy deadlocks here, we raise doubts about democracy everywhere. If we do not in our deeds prove our own ideals, we undermine our security and the sacred mission as the best hope of Earth. But if we do our jobs right, if we treat our colleagues with respect and build the relationships required to form consensus and find the courage to follow through on our promises of compromise, the work we do here will long endure.

So let us in the Senate or in the House be bigger than our own districts, our own States. Let us in spirited purpose be as big as the United States of America. Let us stand for our beliefs but, above all, let us believe in our common history, our common destiny, in our common obligation to love and lead this exceptional Nation. They say politics stops at the water's edge. That is obviously not always true. But if we care for our country, politics has its limits at home and abroad.

As I leave here, I do so knowing that forever the Senate will be in my soul and that our country is my cause and yours. I thank you all for your friendship and the privilege of serving with you.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HAGEL NOMINATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the nomination of Chuck Hagel to be the next Secretary of Defense has already done damage to the credibility of the United States in its attempt to deny Iran a nuclear weapon, thus emboldening one of the most dangerous regimes in the Middle East. To limit that damage, President Obama should choose someone else to lead the Pentagon.

After all, the Nebraska Senator is the same person who has consistently opposed sanctions against Iran. He is the same person who wanted Washington to support Iranian membership in the World Trade Organization. He is the same person who voted against designating the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist group at a time when it was orchestrating the murder of U.S. troops in Iraq.

He is the same person who refused to sign a letter asking the European Union to label Hezbollah—an Iranian proxy—as a terror group, even though it is so designated by the U.S. State Department. He is the same person who urged President Bush to offer Iran "direct, unconditional, and comprehensive talks." He is the same person who called for establishing a U.S. diplomatic mission in Tehran.

He is the same person who dismissed "a military strike against Iran" as "not a viable, feasible, responsible option." And he is the same person who suggested that the United States might be able to live with a nuclear Iran.

During his years in this Chamber, Senator Hagel's opposition to Iran sanctions placed him in a very small minority. For example, only one other Senator joined him in voting against sanctions in 2001, and only one other

Senate Banking Committee member joined him in rejecting a different sanctions package in 2008.

Simply put, Senator Hagel has no credibility on perhaps the biggest foreign policy challenge facing the Obama administration's second term and on American national security interests in the Middle East and around the world.

Consider how his nomination was interpreted by Iranian journalists and government officials. Press TV, a Tehran-based propaganda network, noted with satisfaction that Senator Hagel is known for "his criticism of Washington's anti-Iran policies" and "has consistently opposed any plan to launch [a] military strike against Iran."

The point is, not that we should be threatening military strikes against Iran, but to take this off the table entirely completely undercuts any diplomatic efforts we might take to deny Iran a nuclear weapon.

Meanwhile, a spokesman for the Iranian foreign ministry responded to the Hagel announcement by declaring:

We hope that practical changes will be created in the U.S. foreign policy and . . . that the U.S. officials will favor peace instead of warmongering.

The Iranians are claiming we are the ones warmongering, while they are building a nuclear weapon.

Just for good measure, the Al Jazeera Web site published an article headlined: "Obama defeats the Israel Lobby." Is this really the impression we want to give our adversaries and our allies in the Middle East? Is this how we encourage our friends, to say we will be there to support our allies? Is this the message we want to convey to our adversaries such as Iran, that has threatened the annihilation of Israel, to wipe it off the map? Unfortunately, that is the message that is conveyed by the nomination of Senator Hagel as Secretary of Defense.

Not only has Senator Hagel been a persistent critic of Iran sanctions, he has also displayed a stubborn hostility toward America's closest Middle Eastern ally.

In October 2000, shortly after Yasser Arafat launched the second Intifada, 96 Senators signed a letter to President Clinton affirming their solidarity with Israel. Senator Hagel was not among them. Six months later, after a relentless onslaught of Palestinian terrorism, 87 Senators signed a different letter asking President Bush to "initiate a reassessment of our relations with the Palestinians." Once again, Senator Hagel refused to sign. He also refused to join 89 other Senators in signing a November 2001 letter that urged President Bush to maintain strong support for Israel and to continue snubbing Arafat until the Palestinian leader ended his terror campaign.

On April 12, 2002, a Palestinian suicide bomber killed 6 people and injured more than 100 others in Jerusalem.

That same day, Senator Hagel went to the Senate floor and suggested a moral equivalence between Palestinian terrorism and Israeli self-defense.

Three months later, he published an article in the Washington Post bemoaning "the endless cycle of violence" and declaring that "Israel must take steps to show its commitment to peace."

In a 2003 interview with a local newspaper in Lincoln, NE, Senator Hagel ratcheted up his rhetoric even further, saying the Israelis "keep Palestinians caged up like animals."

In 2009, Senator Hagel coauthored a policy paper that advised President Obama to pursue a dialog with Hamas—again, a State Department-designated terrorist organization; Iran's primary proxy in the area. More specifically, the paper recommended that Washington "offer [Hamas] inducements that will enable its more moderate elements to prevail, and cease discouraging third parties from engaging with Hamas in ways that might help clarify the movement's views and test its behavior."

Most of us believe, including the U.S. State Department, that Hamas' views and behavior are already clear enough: It is committed to the annihilation of Israel; it fires rockets and Iranian-made missiles at civilian areas; and it indoctrinates Palestinian children in a culture of hatred and violence.

Of course, Senator Hagel's most famous comments—or I should say infamous comments—on Israel were delivered during a 2006 interview with former Clinton administration official Aaron David Miller. In that interview, Senator Hagel said "the Jewish lobby intimidates a lot of people up here." These remarks are deeply offensive, but they are also quite revealing, for they confirm that he simply does not understand the true basis of the U.S.-Israeli alliance.

The American people and their elected representatives support Israel for obvious reasons: Both of our countries are pluralistic democracies with a shared commitment to liberty, equality, and basic human rights; both of our countries are threatened by radical Islam; and both of our countries have responded to that threat while remaining free and open societies.

In other words, we have an alliance based on shared values and a common determination to defend liberal democracy against terrorists and dictators alike.

I realize Senator Hagel is now repudiating many of his past actions and statements, but we have seen this before, unfortunately: individuals approaching the confirmation process undergoing a seeming transformation. But this sudden and convenient transformation beggars belief. Senator Hagel has not undergone an abrupt ideological makeover; he just wants to win approval from Members of this Chamber in what we might call a "confirmation conversion."

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to advocate for a secure energy future for our Nation. There is no question that we can achieve energy security or energy independence for our country, and I believe we can do it within the next 5 years.

I define energy security or energy independence as producing more energy than we consume. I mean, this is an interrelated, high-tech global economy. Energy will move back and forth between nations, but we truly become energy secure when we produce more energy than we consume. But to do that, to achieve energy independence or energy security, we must take the commonsense steps necessary to achieve it. That is why today, once again, I call on President Obama to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline project now that Governor Heineman of Nebraska has approved the new route through his State of Nebraska.

The Keystone XL Pipeline is not just about bringing Canadian oil to U.S. refineries, it is also vital to move our own U.S.-produced oil through our refineries. In fact, that is how I got involved with this project in the first place.

Although it is hard to believe, TransCanada first applied for approval of this project 4½ years ago. Let me repeat that—4½ years ago. At that time, I was Governor of North Dakota, and I was working with Governor Brian Schweitzer, of Montana, to make sure that oil producers in the Bakken regions of our States, in North Dakota and Montana, could put light sweet crude oil from the Bakken into the Keystone XL Pipeline. We met with TransCanada, contacted our oil producers, met with TransCanada, and they agreed. TransCanada agreed to an on-ramp so that the Keystone XL Pipeline would move North Dakota and Montana light sweet crude from the Bakken to refineries throughout the United States—to refineries in Illinois, Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil from our oilfields from day one.