

BUSINESS MEETING

Tuesday, September 23, 2008



U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

BUSINESS MEETING

Tuesday, September 23, 2008

U.S. SENATE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
WASHINGTON, D.C.

1 The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 3:08 p.m. in Room S-116, The Capitol, Hon.
2 Christopher Dodd, presiding.

3 PRESENT: Senators Dodd [presiding], Kerry, Feingold, Nelson, Cardin, Lugar, Hagel,
4 Coleman, Corker, Murkowski, Isakson, and Barrasso.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER DODD, U.S. SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT

5 SENATOR DODD: The committee will come to order.

6 We don't have enough yet for a quorum, to move legislation, but we have enough to
7 talk. What I thought we might do is just tell you, quickly, how we're going to try and do this.
8 And I appreciate members adjusting their schedules to be here, in light of the fact that several of
9 us here on this committee spent all morning with the Banking Committee on the financial crisis
10 issues.

11 Senator Biden, as all of you are aware, is otherwise occupied and busy, and so I'm acting
12 chair of this committee. In fact, I'm acting chair of every committee.

13 [Laughter.]

14 SENATOR DODD: And so, as we've been dealing with this—I was talking to Senator
15 Biden the other night, and having followed this issue carefully—nowhere near as carefully as
16 Senator Lugar and other members of the committee—and we'll get into the matter shortly on

1 the U.S.-India Nuclear Accords that—I became an expert on tritiated water, by the way, and—
2 learning all of these technical terms in part of our hearings the other day. We had a very good
3 hearing on Georgia as well.

4 And today, a full agenda that will include some nominations, a couple of treaties, some
5 legislation. And my goal would be, unless people want to have separate votes on them, that the
6 nominations, we'll do en bloc; the treaties and the legislation—now, some people want treaties
7 to have a separate vote, but I think we can do them en bloc, unless there are comments. And
8 then, of course, item number 9 on your agenda, dealing with the United States-India
9 agreement—I know Senator Feingold, Senator Boxer, maybe others, have some ideas and
10 thoughts, and clearly that will take a separate action by the committee. So, I won't ask,
11 obviously, that be done en bloc. But, I know that some members have some interest in these
12 matters, and if you'd like to use this time, right now, to express your views on those, I'll be
13 happy to—

14 Senator Feingold?

15 SENATOR FEINGOLD: Just quickly, on item 3, S. 2609. I want to thank the Chairman
16 for placing this on the agenda. It's called Global Service Fellowship Program Act. I want to
17 thank Senator Coleman for cosponsoring it.

18 This is an opportunity to invest in improving the perception of the United States
19 overseas. And I firmly believe U.S. citizens involved here internationally, and their capacity as
20 citizen diplomats, have the potential to be very effective public diplomacy tools. So, this
21 creates—authorizes volunteers for prosperity in establishing the Global Service Fellowship.
22 This will enable thousands of additional volunteers to serve overseas, where they will address

1 critical human needs and build bridges across cultures and promote mutual understanding. So,
2 I think this is a positive bipartisan initiative, and I thank all the colleagues for their
3 cosponsorship and support.

4 SENATOR DODD: Any other comments on this?

5 Senator Isakson, you had a comment?

6 SENATOR ISAKSON: I have a question, Mr. Chairman. I was talking—

7 SENATOR DODD: Yes.

8 SENATOR ISAKSON: —to staff. Are any one of the items included in here dealing with
9 the South Korean issue?

10 Mr. Chairman, there's a—as you know, there's a—or, as I have come to find out, there is
11 a pending sale to the South Koreans, one of our great partners—the House and Senate are
12 differing on the language in this regarding South Korea. Am I saying this correctly? And I just
13 want to go on record as saying that I'm a big supporter of South Korea, our friend. I think their
14 status—I think the question is, What is their status level, in terms of equality with Japan? Am I
15 saying that right? And I think their status is equal as a partner of ours, and I would hope the
16 Senate position—I understand the Senate committee has made a change that deviates from
17 what the House position is, and I just want to weigh in, so when this goes to conference, I
18 would hope the Senate would recognize the importance of South Korea and their position, vis-
19 a-vis weapons purchases, vis-a-vis status, such as Japan.

20 SENATOR DODD: Does staff have any comment on this?

21 SENATOR ISAKSON: I understand that's what has happening.

1 SENATOR LUGAR: In response to Senator Isakson, the staff has given me this
2 language, rapidly, that says a version of the South Korean—this is included in the Security
3 Assistance Act we're considering today at section 127 of the bill, but we're confident we will be
4 able to find agreement with the House counterparts on a version of this legislation that could
5 include additional authorities related to defense cooperation with Korea beyond those in
6 section 127 and like those provisions we have granted to NATO countries, Australia, Japan, and
7 New Zealand.

8 So, at least we have assurances from staff that they're working with their House
9 counterparts to apparently upgrade whatever may be the status in this 127 to something
10 comparable to NATO, Australia, Japan, and New Zealand.

11 SENATOR CORKER: Mr. Chairman, since we're filibustering, I want to say to Russ that
12 I appreciate the sense of what you're trying to do with that bill. I think we couldn't take an
13 inventory of all the programs that existed like that in the State Department, so I'm going to vote
14 against it, but it's not because I don't like the sense of what it is you're trying to do. I just wish
15 we could keep up with all of them and know what we're doing.

16 The Brazil relationship, we're basically asking the Secretary of State to set up a foreign
17 emissions trading program with Brazil and other entities nearby, and I just wish you could
18 expand on that. That gives me a little bit of nervousness, and I've been highly involved in the
19 debate, and find it most interesting. But, we, here, are not doing that, and I just—that troubles
20 me a little bit. And I hope the Ranking Member might be able to address that.

21 SENATOR LUGAR: Let me respond to the Senator. The overall idea of the Brazil
22 agreement is, once again, to recognize the remarkable progress they have made with ethanol

1 out of sugarcane, with flexible-fuel cars and what amounts to almost energy independence in
2 their country—75 to 80 percent flexible fuel.

3 The particular item you're talking about refers to an experiment, such as the Chicago
4 Climate Exchange in our country. And I plead guilty for being a member of this, as a farmer.
5 Our trees are producing or storing carbon. But, it is an experiment, so that if we ever come to a
6 carbon exchange program with the voluntary contributions by businesses who are involved, the
7 farmers and so forth, there will be a mechanism along the lines that I understand of the Chicago
8 Climate Exchange.

9 SENATOR CORKER: So, this will be a voluntary exchange, trying to make people feel
10 good about themselves.

11 SENATOR LUGAR: The institutional apparatus will be there.

12 SENATOR DODD: Let me just commend Senator Lugar and Senator Hagel, as well as
13 the principal cosponsor of this, and I, as someone who's been the chair and ranking member
14 dealing with Western Hemisphere over the years, think this is a great step forward. The
15 Western Hemisphere and Latin America—I think—well, we know this region is already an
16 energy producer, an exporter of energy. And obviously what Brazil is doing, we're envious of,
17 to some degree. It's remarkable how they've been proceeding. So, I think cooperation on this
18 makes an awful lot of sense, and I would add myself as a cosponsor to the bill. I think it's a
19 great idea. I appreciate Senator Corker's question.

20 SENATOR CORKER: If I could, I actually planned to go there to look at how we might
21 preserve that forest between now and January 1st, and I hope that, as we figure out a way to do
22 it, that it doesn't distort the carbon market we have here.

1 SENATOR DODD: That's a good point, as well.

2 Any other comments on this? Senator Nelson? Or other issues?

3 SENATOR LUGAR: Mr. Chairman, just a second, let me just mention—because it will
4 go by the boards, I suppose, but we're going to ask for NATO membership for Albania and
5 Croatia. This is a very important moment in the lives of those two countries that should be
6 noted. They've spent almost 7 or 8 years in preparation for membership, with the Membership
7 Action Plan, and have finally fulfilled all of those obligations. And so, I just wanted to make a
8 special note that—and I hope it will be by unanimous consent. This is a great moment for those
9 two nations, and our relations with those two nations.

10 SENATOR DODD: I couldn't agree more, and am delighted to have the honor of
11 chairing the committee in which, I hope—as Senator Lugar suggested – this would be a
12 unanimous vote. And we're deeply honored today to have, in this very small and historic
13 room, the Ambassador from Croatia and the Ambassador from Albania with us. And you
14 might just rise and be recognized. We thank you very much for being with us. We're delighted
15 to have you with us.

16 [Applause.]

17 SENATOR DODD: And we'll leave, by the way, the record open for anyone who wants
18 to add comments on any of these matters.

[The information previously referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

19 SENATOR DODD: We will come to—is someone counting, here? We're too short for
20 doing some business.

1 Senator Nelson?

2 SENATOR NELSON OF FLORIDA: May I speak to item 4?

3 SENATOR DODD: You certainly may.

4 SENATOR NELSON OF FLORIDA: Mr. Chairman, the United States has invested \$100
5 billion in the development and assembling and building of an International Space Station, along
6 with the Russians. And it actually goes back to when the Russians were still the Soviets. We've
7 had an extraordinary cooperation and a very successful conclusion. But, there is a waiver that
8 we need to pass here in the law that says that you can't contribute money to a country if they're
9 assisting in the nuclear program of Iran or North Korea or Syria. And we all know that the
10 Russians are, in fact, contributing to that program in Iran, and we're trying to get them turned
11 around to where they won't. Well, here's what's facing us. We have to waive this law in order
12 to give NASA the contractual authority to go on and build additional Soyuz spacecraft so that
13 we can get to and from the very Space Station that we have built and paid for.

14 Why? Because there's only one rescue or lifeboat. And that is the Soyuz spacecraft.
15 And we have to always keep one of those attached to the Space Station in case there's an
16 emergency and you've got to get the crew home.

17 But, number two, due to the mismanagement of the space program, we now are
18 confronting, between the year 2010, when we shut down the Space Shuttle, and 2015, the
19 earliest at which we can get the new rocket developed and ready for human flight—the only
20 way to get to the Space Station is not on an American vehicle, it's going to be on the Russian
21 vehicle. And therefore, since you need about a 3-year ahead time—3 years ahead in order to get

1 this thing build, NASA needs to contract now with the Russian Space Agency in order to have
2 the availability of the spacecraft in 2012, when the present contract runs out in 2011.

3 Now, let me just say one other thing. This doesn't have anything to do with our vote
4 today, but it expresses the frustration that I have. Here we are, facing a \$700-billion additional
5 add to the deficit because of this potential economic meltdown that we're facing, and what that
6 means is that all the agencies of government, including little old NASA, which has been picked
7 on by the White House Management and Budget and is the reason that we're in this
8 predicament in the first place, that we're coming to you today to waive this law. And we're
9 going to have this big gap, with no American vehicle to get to our own Space Station. This
10 \$700-billion additional deficit that we're about to consider, there's not going to be any money
11 for any agency, much less NASA to try to lessen that gap of 5 years by accelerating our rocket
12 program. The new rocket is called Aries, and the new capsule is called Orion. But, we don't
13 have anything else we can do. I wish it weren't this way, but at least, Mr. Chairman, we've got
14 to have access to our own Space Station, and that's why we've got to waive this law.

15 SENATOR DODD: Senator, I thank you for that. This is a proposal by Senators Biden
16 and Lugar, as well, and Senator Nelson has explained it very thoroughly.

17 And we now have a quorum present to do some business.

18 As I mentioned at the outset, before some of you arrived, my intention is to, first of all,
19 deal with as many items en bloc as we can.

20 And the first order of business would be the nominations that are before us: Brian
21 Hook, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations; Sung Kim, the rank of
22 Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Envoy for the Six-Party Talks; Gregori

1 Lebedev, to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N.
2 Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador and to be the Alternate U.S.
3 Representative to the U.N. General Assembly during his tenure of service as Representative for
4 U.N. Management and Reform; Mr. Clifford May, to be a member of the Broadcasting Board of
5 Governors; Mr. Steven McGann, to be Ambassador to Fiji Islands and other nation-states in the
6 area there; Mr. Dennis Mulhaupt—I apologize for mispronunciation of that name—to be a
7 member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors; and Matthew Reynolds—and let me just say,
8 Matt Reynolds—Matt is here with us in the room, and Matt has been Acting Assistant Secretary
9 for some time, and I'm glad we're finally doing this. You do a good job in this office, and we're
10 delighted, today, to have you on the agenda here to finally recognize your more permanent
11 status—Matt Reynolds, to be the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs; and Carol
12 Rodley, to be Ambassador to Cambodia.

13 SENATOR LUGAR: I move the slate.

14 SENATOR KERRY: Second.

15 SENATOR DODD: All in favor, say aye.

16 [A chorus of ayes.]

17 SENATOR DODD: Opposed, no.

18 [No response.]

19 SENATOR DODD: The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it. And the nominations
20 are approved.

1 The second group of items that I would like to deal with are the treaties and the
2 legislation, with the exception of item number—I believe it's 9, the U.S.-Indian Peaceful Nuclear
3 Cooperation.

4 You've already heard several conversations on a couple of these items already. And,
5 again, I want to take note—and normally, I think, we deal with treaties differently, because
6 votes are a higher regard. If anyone wants to be heard on these, I would be glad—are there any
7 comments on these treaties or legislation?

8 SENATOR LUGAR: I move adoption of the treaties and legislation.

9 SENATOR KERRY: Second.

10 SENATOR DODD: All those in favor, say aye.

11 [A chorus of ayes.]

12 SENATOR DODD: Opposed, no.

13 [No response.]

14 SENATOR DODD: The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it. Congratulations to
15 Albania and Croatia. They've moved one step forward in the committee.

16 [Applause.]

17 SENATOR DODD: And now let's turn to item number 9. I'm sorry, we did the treaties.

18 SENATOR LUGAR: I move all items of legislation, except for number 9.

19 SENATOR DODD: All in favor, say aye.

20 [A chorus of ayes.]

21 SENATOR DODD: Opposed, no.

22 [No response.]

1 SENATOR DODD: The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it. The legislation is
2 agreed to.

3 Now we'll move to item number 9 on the agenda. Let me turn to Senator Lugar for
4 some opening comments, then I'll make some, then we'll turn to our colleagues who have some
5 thoughts on this, as well.

6 SENATOR LUGAR: Item number 9 is the India Nuclear Treaty. It has been considered,
7 for some time, but came to the fore after the Indian Parliament approved it, and then the IAEA
8 approved it, and the Users Group. Essentially, negotiations have proceeded intensively
9 between the Democratic staff and the Republican staff and the State Department. They are in
10 unison with regard to the language that is in number 9.

11 I must say, at this point, the House of Representatives position is still unknown as to
12 whether they will agree with this position, but there have been intensive talks, back and forth,
13 with only an item or two that was in some disagreement, so we can be hopeful. But, it seems to
14 me this is a situation on which the administration very strongly favors this. The Secretary of
15 State and the President both weighed in, and this is very important for our country and our
16 relationships. And so, my hope is that we would ratify at least our part today in the Foreign
17 Relations Committee.

18 SENATOR DODD: Well, thank you, Senator Lugar.

19 And, again, let me emphasize, Senator Biden, of course, has spent a great deal of time on
20 this during his stewardship as chairman of the committee, and obviously he's not with us today.

21 We had a very good hearing the other day on the subject matter. The administration witnesses
22 were very, very good. There was a lot of participation by members as well.

1 I support this. I know there are very legitimate issues that some of our colleagues are
2 raising, but I think the issues surrounding the bilateral relationship and the geopolitical
3 questions, as well as the importance of drawing India into this process to help reduce the
4 threats of nuclear weaponry really are going to be tremendously valuable to us in the years
5 ahead.

6 And Senator Biden, I presume, will have a statement to include in the record at this
7 juncture. And I have a statement, as well, that I would ask consent to be included in the record.

[The information previously referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

8 SENATOR DODD: Any members who want to include their comments, as well.

[The information previously referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

9 SENATOR DODD: At this point, I'll open the floor for any amendments.

10 Senator Feingold?

11 SENATOR FEINGOLD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 I'm offering an amendment that would require the United States to seek an agreement
13 from the members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, or NSG, prohibiting the transfer of
14 enrichment and reprocessing technologies to countries that are not members of the NPT.
15 Proposed amendment to the energy guidelines would not single out India, but would instead
16 require the administration to seek a broad rule that no supplier country will transfer the
17 technologies needed to make fissile materials into weapons. This amendment should not really
18 be controversial, as the administration and other NSG states have been working since 2004 to
19 strengthen restrictions on the transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technology.

1 And so, I would ask—that's the reason the amendment is offered, is—why not make it a
2 binding commitment? If we accepted this amendment, it would have a meaningful impact.
3 Although there's obviously no silver bullet for fixing this badly flawed agreement, as Secretary
4 Burns acknowledged last week at our hearing, there's no guarantee that cooperating with
5 India's civilian energy program will not indirectly benefit its weapons program, but my
6 amendment would limit the damage by ensuring that no transfers are possible to India or any
7 other nonentity state of the technologies that could benefit their weapons program.

8 We must try to get a consensus. I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of my
9 amendment and help ensure that this agreement does not further undermine the existing
10 nonproliferation regime.

11 SENATOR DODD: Well, let me, if I can, just briefly, respond and thank our colleague
12 for his thoughts on the matter. It's an interesting proposal. And by all reports, the
13 administration has been trying to achieve, in fact, what Senator Feingold is proposing with his
14 amendment. But, let me tell you the reasons there's been objections to it.

15 The Nuclear Suppliers Group has also considered additional restrictions on transfers of
16 enrichment and reprocessing equipment and technology, and there are disagreements on those
17 other restrictions, as you might imagine. So, the NSG, the Nuclear Suppliers Group, may not
18 reach a consensus on that until sometime next year, and this gets at the heart of why there's
19 concern about this, given the importance of the timeliness of what we're doing. No supplier has
20 any near-term plans for enrichment or reprocessing, we're told, of any transfers to India. So, the
21 industry has time to work out its new policy. If we make that new policy a condition for the
22 India agreement's entry into force, we will both delay that agreement, and there's concern about

1 what political problems may emerge in India that could undermine U.S. efforts in the NSG
2 program.

3 The bill before us already requires the President to certify that it is U.S. policy to achieve
4 further restrictions on these transfers. Again, I commend Senator Feingold for what he's trying
5 to achieve legislatively here. That is really a reference to Senator Feingold's objectives, and that
6 is not likely to get any foreign enrichment or reprocessing technology, not under the U.S.
7 agreement, and not under the agreements with other supplier countries. Therefore, the
8 rationale and need for the amendment, I think, is not as strong as would otherwise be the case.
9 And for those reasons, we urge the defeat of the amendment.

10 Senator Lugar?

11 SENATOR LUGAR: Mr. Chairman, I would simply indicate, the biggest problem in the
12 Senator's amendment is, it will send the U.S. nuclear pact back to Nuclear Suppliers Group for
13 an issue unrelated to this agreement. The NSG has already spoken on this matter by holding
14 the India agreement hostage, and the matter to which the NSG is already spoken would be
15 irresponsible, in my judgment, and forfeit prospects of agreement coming into force in the near
16 future, and prevent the President, even if the Congress approves the deal, from bringing into
17 force until the NSG has amended its guidelines to prohibit enrichment and reprocessing of any
18 country not a party in the NPT.

19 And that would certainly mean the 123 Agreement with India could not enter into force
20 this year, given the calendar for both Congress—and perhaps not even next year. Even if we
21 approve it, it will put our whole effort with India into a complex negotiation of countries that

1 have already approved it, and possibly take years of negotiations to achieve. I'm not ready to
2 do that. And therefore, I would oppose the amendment.

3 SENATOR DODD: Does anyone else wish to be heard on this?

4 SENATOR FEINGOLD: Just a quick response. I think allowing this amendment to go
5 through allows us—this to be approved by our government, by the United States, and that's a
6 significant step forward. The fact that there might have to be another thing done, which
7 apparently the parties have already agreed to, it seems to me, is a pretty minor obstacle. And I
8 would think that people would support this agreement, would find it reasonable. And, in fact,
9 I've been given assurances everybody's okay with this. This doesn't delay, unnecessarily, the
10 process at all. It doesn't have to come back to Congress. And so, it seems to me this is a fair
11 requirement.

12 SENATOR DODD: Senator Kerry?

13 SENATOR KERRY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I—as Senator Feingold knows, I have great
14 respect for his commitment to nonproliferation, and I think he's really done a lot of good things
15 with respect to that. I do share the view of the Chair and the Ranking Member, that it is a
16 mistake to formally include it here. I think it's a good idea that we ought to positively pursue,
17 but the Nuclear Suppliers Group works by consensus, and if we formally put this in the four
18 corners of what we're agreeing to, it becomes a unilateral imposition, which always carries with
19 it a lot of problems, particularly at this particular moment, I might add.

20 Moreover, the Nuclear Suppliers Group has let it be known, quietly, that there really is
21 already an agreement and an understanding that none of the members intend to sell or supply
22 any of those products. And so, I think the best thing to do is to take the Senator's concept under

1 advisement, if you would, and maybe the committee might, sort of, formally submit it to the
2 administration and say, "Look, you ought to report back to us within a period of time about
3 your success in getting that consensus," but not to put it, again, within the four corners of the
4 agreement, formally, now.

5 And I think, you know, what's important here is to recognize that the IAEA director,
6 General ElBaradei, and Russia or France or Britain, are all extremely supportive of the current
7 structure. I think they have as much interest as we do in seeing this pursued, but not formally
8 within the agreement. So, I would hope we would just—I think rejecting it should not be
9 viewed as a rejection of the concept, it should simply be that we think we ought to proceed
10 forward without delay now.

11 SENATOR FEINGOLD: Just one quick comment, just with regard to Senator Kerry's
12 remarks. And, of course, they're very reasonable. I would say this. If you compare the
13 unilateral aspect of what I'm proposing, compared to the unilateral opening up of this deal with
14 India and tightening the entire nonproliferation regime, there's no comparison. It's a very
15 minor thing to ask, in light of the fact that there's apparently consensus. This is a pretty
16 dramatic thing we're doing with regard to nonproliferation. All I'm asking is that we take
17 advantage of the fact that apparently these countries are in pretty much agreement of this to
18 move forward on that point. I obviously take the Senator's point and am happy to have a vote.

19 SENATOR KERRY: Just—before you vote, I would just comment on that. I mean, I
20 wrestled with that, long and hard, from 1985 forward, on this issue, on proliferation. But, it
21 seems to me that when you have a country as significant as India and as much of a player in the
22 region as they are with respect to China and Pakistan that are prepared to put the vast majority

1 of its nuclear facilities under IAEA, which they aren't today as a non-signer of the NPT, and to
2 declare publicly separate civil and military, and to put that under IAEA and inspection, we are
3 significantly ahead of where we are today. And I don't see how you can deal with that.
4 Otherwise, it's one of those glass-half-full-half-empty deals. But, I certainly think you have to
5 say that that is a plus, and that's why I think the IAEA and others are supportive of it.

6 SENATOR DODD: Well, I thank Senator Kerry for his comments. It's very well said.
7 And those are my sentiments, as well, that it doesn't in any way minimize the importance of
8 what Senator Feingold is attempting. And maybe as just as a thought—because I think there's
9 probably unanimous consensus that what Senator Feingold has suggested is something all of us
10 probably embrace—the possibility of a letter, that Senator Feingold might initiate and we might
11 sign, as a way of expressing our continuing interest in this to the administration as a way to be
12 transferred to the NSG. This might be one way to really advance this particular issue.

13 Nonetheless, does anyone else wish to be heard on this matter?

14 SENATOR NELSON OF FLORIDA: Mr. Chairman, would you want to suggest, for
15 example, as we're dealing with this \$700-billion bailout, that we just suggest some guidelines
16 instead of nailing it down?

17 SENATOR DODD: I suspect we're going to hear that speech with some frequency on a
18 variety of items coming up over the next few years.

19 Let's call the roll on the Feingold amendment. The Clerk will call the roll.

20 THE CLERK: Mr. Biden?

21 SENATOR DODD: No, by proxy.

22 THE CLERK: Mr. Kerry?

1 SENATOR KERRY: No.

2 THE CLERK: Mr. Feingold?

3 SENATOR FEINGOLD: Aye.

4 THE CLERK: Mrs. Boxer?

5 SENATOR DODD: Aye.

6 THE CLERK: Mr. Nelson?

7 SENATOR NELSON OF FLORIDA: No.

8 THE CLERK: Mr. Obama?

9 [No response.]

10 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?

11 [No response.]

12 THE CLERK: Mr. Cardin?

13 SENATOR CARDIN: No.

14 THE CLERK: Mr. Casey?

15 SENATOR DODD: Aye.

16 THE CLERK: Mr. Webb?

17 SENATOR DODD: Aye, by proxy.

18 THE CLERK: Mr. Lugar?

19 SENATOR LUGAR: No.

20 THE CLERK: Mr. Hagel?

21 SENATOR HAGEL: No.

22 THE CLERK: Mr. Coleman?

1 SENATOR COLEMAN: No.

2 THE CLERK: Mr. Corker?

3 SENATOR LUGAR: No, by proxy.

4 THE CLERK: Mr. Voinovich?

5 SENATOR LUGAR: No, by proxy.

6 THE CLERK: Ms. Murkowski?

7 SENATOR MURKOWSKI: No.

8 THE CLERK: Mr. DeMint?

9 SENATOR LUGAR: No, by proxy.

10 THE CLERK: Mr. Isakson?

11 SENATOR ISAKSON: No.

12 THE CLERK: Mr. Vitter?

13 SENATOR LUGAR: No, by proxy.

14 THE CLERK: Mr. Barrasso?

15 SENATOR BARRASSO: No.

16 THE CLERK: Mr. Chairman?

17 SENATOR DODD: No.

18 THE CLERK: Four ayes, 15 nays.

19 SENATOR LUGAR: I move adoption of the treaty.

20 SENATOR KERRY: Second.

21 SENATOR FEINGOLD: I ask for a roll-call vote.

22 SENATOR DODD: The Clerk will call the roll.

1 THE CLERK: Mr. Biden?
2 SENATOR DODD: Aye, by proxy.
3 THE CLERK: Mr. Kerry?
4 SENATOR KERRY: Aye.
5 THE CLERK: Mr. Feingold?
6 SENATOR FEINGOLD: No.
7 THE CLERK: Mrs. Boxer?
8 SENATOR DODD: No, by proxy.
9 THE CLERK: Mr. Nelson?
10 SENATOR NELSON OF FLORIDA: Aye.
11 THE CLERK: Mr. Obama?
12 SENATOR DODD: Aye, by proxy.
13 THE CLERK: Mr. Menendez?
14 SENATOR DODD: Aye, by proxy.
15 THE CLERK: Mr. Cardin?
16 SENATOR CARDIN: Aye.
17 THE CLERK: Mr. Casey?
18 SENATOR DODD: Aye, by proxy.
19 THE CLERK: Mr. Webb?
20 SENATOR DODD: Aye, by proxy.
21 THE CLERK: Mr. Lugar?
22 SENATOR LUGAR: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Mr. Hagel?
2 SENATOR HAGEL: Aye.
3 THE CLERK: Mr. Coleman?
4 SENATOR COLEMAN: Aye.
5 THE CLERK: Mr. Corker?
6 SENATOR LUGAR: Aye, by proxy.
7 THE CLERK: Mr. Voinovich?
8 SENATOR LUGAR: Aye, by proxy.
9 THE CLERK: Ms. Murkowski?
10 SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Aye.
11 THE CLERK: Mr. DeMint?
12 SENATOR LUGAR: Aye, by proxy.
13 THE CLERK: Mr. Isakson?
14 SENATOR ISAKSON: Aye.
15 THE CLERK: Mr. Vitter?
16 SENATOR LUGAR: Aye, by proxy.
17 THE CLERK: Mr. Barrasso?
18 SENATOR BARRASSO: Aye.
19 THE CLERK: Mr. Chairman?
20 SENATOR DODD: Aye.
21 THE CLERK: Nineteen ayes, 2 nays.
22 SENATOR DODD: The treaty is agreed to.

1 This is the last business meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee. It's been an honor
2 to be your chairman.

3 [Laughter.]

4 [Applause.]

5 SENATOR DODD: On behalf of Senator Biden, I would like to make note that there are
6 a number of people, and a lot of good work has come out of this committee over this session of
7 Congress, and Brian McKeon, Ed Levine, Anthony Wier, Kenny Myers, Tom Moore, and Jason
8 Bruder, a lot of other staff people, made this a successful session. Senator Biden wanted to
9 express his gratitude to everyone here for their work, and gratitude to Senator Lugar, his friend
10 and partner in all of this, and members of the committee.

11 So, thank you all very, very much, and we look forward to seeing you in January.

12 This committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:40 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.]