

the fiscal consequences will be when the bottom drops out. Instead, what we need are genuine pro-growth policies designed to help small businesses and middle-class families.

We don't need more government intervention; we need more entrepreneurship and more innovation. Government must simply take its boot off the neck of the great American jobs engine. After all, this is still the most dynamic economy on Earth, and America continues to attract the best and brightest from around the world who want to come to America to achieve their own version of the American dream. With better leadership—particularly from the President, whose leadership is required—there is no reason we cannot turn this slow economic growth around and turn it into fast growth, which in turn will increase private sector job creation. It will create more taxpayers who will pay more money into the Treasury, which will help us close that deficit. In the process, we need to expand economic opportunity for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

HAGEL NOMINATION

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, even though the confirmation hearing regarding the nomination of former Senator Chuck Hagel for Secretary of Defense is going on before the Armed Services Committee, I would like to make some comments in terms of my thoughts regarding his potential appointment and the conclusion I have come to based on the 130 pages of written answers to questions posed to Senator Hagel by the Senate Armed Services Committee and some of the information I have gleaned, as my schedule has allowed, from his testimony before the SASC—ongoing, as I said.

Based on his written answers and what I have heard so far, it is clear that Senator Hagel is willing to execute the policies established and endorsed by the President. But the idea floated out of the White House, what the President has described as bipartisan balance—that is why Senator Hagel was selected—to consideration of these critical issues before us regarding the role of the next Secretary of Defense, doesn't hold water.

As I said, Senator Hagel has essentially indicated on a number of occasions—through his written answers and through his answers to the SASC committee—that he is in line with the President's policies and, in fact, in some cases, to the left of some of those policies.

It is obvious that I and many of my Republican colleagues disagree with many of the views and policy positions taken by the administration and Senator Hagel. This is to be expected. Most policy differences should not be sufficient reason to oppose a nomination of a President's preferred Cabinet ap-

pointment. Elections have consequences, and the President does have the right to his own advisers. However, this usual tolerance of alternative views has its limits. For me, the limit is when a nominee is of such a high position, such as the Secretary of Defense, and that nominee has a point of view which places the United States in greater danger, which I believe is the case for this nominee, then I think we have to ask ourselves a number of questions before we give our support and before we make our decision.

Senator Hagel's views about the threat posed by Iran's nuclear ambitions and the best way to counter that threat are significantly inconsistent with my own, inconsistent with America's responsibilities, I believe, at this moment in history, and inconsistent with the security needs of our country and the survival of our friends.

I have been focused on the Iranian nuclear threat for more than 5 years. After I left my position as Ambassador to Germany and returned to the private sector, I joined the Bipartisan Policy Center. Together with former Democrat Senator Chuck Robb, we co-chaired a project on Iran. The Bipartisan Policy Center has been on the front lines of those ringing alarm bells about the situation in Iran and its pursuit of nuclear weapons. We issued our first report in 2008 entitled "Meeting the Challenge: U.S. Policy Toward Iranian Nuclear Development." I was involved in producing a second, more urgent report in 2009 entitled, "Meeting the Challenge: Time is Running Out."

After I left the Bipartisan Policy Center and returned to the Senate, the organization produced two more reports on the subject, each more urgent than the last, and each demanding clearer, more vigorous, and more determined U.S. policy to avert this ever present danger. Each year since the beginning of my involvement in this Bipartisan Policy Committee project, I have become increasingly worried about Iran's continuing irresponsible and dangerous behavior and the administration's inconsistent, unsure policies to respond to this growing threat.

Preventing Iran from gaining nuclear weapons capability is the most urgent foreign policy matter facing the United States and international security. The consequences of a nuclear weapons-capable Iran are not tolerable, not acceptable, and must motivate the most powerful and effective methods and efforts possible to prevent this from happening. Based on his record as a Senator and subsequent public statements, I do not believe Senator Hagel agrees with this assessment.

Since returning to the Senate, I have joined many colleagues in pressing for a robust, comprehensive, three-track effort to raise the stakes for the Iranian regime and compel it to live up to its commitments and halt its weapons program. The first track is enhanced diplomatic efforts—and I mean enhanced. We have pressed the adminis-

tration to create, invigorate, and motivate a much enhanced international coalition devoted to one single objective: to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons.

This doesn't mean simply repeated outreaches to the Iranian regime itself to engage in dialogue. The Obama administration came into office promising such discussions, but this has gone nowhere, nor have other diplomatic efforts, either unilateral or multilateral. All such diplomatic efforts have failed—all such diplomatic efforts have failed—for nearly a decade in achieving the goal of preventing Iran from its continuous and relentless pursuit of developing nuclear weapons.

Senator Hagel, whose life story brings him to a justifiable reliance on dialogue before the use of force—a preference which we all understand and we all share—has, in my opinion, an exaggerated and unrealistic belief in what dialogue and diplomacy can accomplish. This is especially so when the dialogue partner is a revolutionary regime of zealots with a self-declared historical mission rather than rational leaders of a nation state—a huge distinction between dialogue with rational states and dialogue with Iran and its irrational leadership.

Senator Hagel has long called for direct, unconditional talks with the Iranian regime, not to mention direct talks with Hamas, Hezbollah, and Syria as well. He has pressed that such talks should proceed without the backing gained from other, more forceful, credible options. This approach is far too weak to be effective and reveals a person less committed to results than this critical moment demands.

The second track of a comprehensive search for a solution is sanctions. I have supported all legislative efforts to create and impose both unilateral and multilateral sanctions on Iran, leveraging similar commitments from our friends and allies when possible, and pursuing unilateral sanctions when necessary. Indeed, it has been our willingness to impose sanctions by unilateral action that arguably has stiffened the spine of the international community and made increasingly harsh multilateral sanctions regimes possible.

Senator Hagel does not see it that way. He repeatedly voted against sanctions legislation, even opposing those aimed at the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, which at the time was killing our troops in Iraq. He has long argued against sanctions imposed by the United States absent an international judgment by others that we are doing the right thing. He has not seen the connection between America's firmness, determination and leadership, and international acquiescence. It is his instinct to give a veto to Brussels or Paris or even Moscow and Beijing, and I cannot support the nomination of a Secretary of Defense who shows such deference to foreign politicians.

Senator Hagel has famously agreed publicly that the United States is a

bully. I assume our reliance on unilateral sanctions when necessary may fit his definition of bully. I cannot possibly agree.

The third track of a comprehensive approach to this crucial problem is open discussion of, and early preparation for, military options. It has become increasingly clear over the past several years that diplomacy and sanctions alone are too weak to compel Iranian compliance with the international communities' demands. A frank discussion of military options and preparations give credibility to the rest of our strategy. No one should suppose these steps mean anything other than preparing the ground for the logical and necessary access to measures of last resort.

At the Bipartisan Policy Center, I participated in an exhaustive analysis of all of the means and consequences of a potential military action against Iran's nuclear weapons program. There were no war advocates among us. Nevertheless, if it is true that a nuclear weapons-capable Iran is unacceptable, as now four U.S. Presidents have publicly declared, including the current President, then our Nation and the international community as a whole must see with vivid clarity what measures remain should the first two tracks fail to achieve the objective.

The Iranian regime must be especially clear-eyed and nondelusional about those potential consequences should it not change its behavior. Indeed, to give the diplomatic and sanctions tracks the essential credibility they require, then a military option must be entirely believable if, as the President has repeatedly said, Iranian possession of nuclear arms capability is unacceptable.

I cannot conclude that Senator Hagel views the military option in this credible way. Indeed, he has maintained in recent years that "a military strike against Iran is not a viable, feasible, responsible option."

Many of us have examined Senator Hagel's on-the-record comments carefully and parsed each one to determine what his views on these important subjects actually are. In the meantime, he has hastened to apparently amend the record so that his advocates can point to more recent statements that seem to negate the earlier ones. But this is not a court of law, and we are not looking for admissible evidence. Rather, we are defining the basis for our own judgments on how the full pattern of words and behavior define the views and likely future behavior of the nominee.

In so doing, I have concluded that when Senator Hagel pays lip service now to the contention that "all options are on the table," it does not reveal his real, extinctive, and strong disinclination to consider military force if it becomes necessary. For me, that is very nearly a disqualifying position for any Secretary of Defense.

A related concern is what I believe to be Senator Hagel's views about the so-

called containment option. This is related to his nearly notorious views about nuclear proliferation in general. He has famously said "the genie of nuclear weapons is already out of the bottle, no matter what Iran does." I fear Senator Hagel holds the mistaken view that a nuclear-armed Iran is more palatable than the consequences of going to war to prevent it. That is a dangerously corrosive idea.

Indeed, my concern was heightened this morning when Senator Hagel, in testimony before the Armed Services Committee, referred twice to his support for containment. It was only when someone handed him a note, presumably reminding him the administration's formal position did not support containment, did he correct himself and say he didn't support it either.

So what are we to conclude relative to what he truly believes and where he actually stands on a number of issues vital to our national security? The supreme fallacy of the containment option as modified is that it severs the spine of all of our friends and allies who are justifiably appalled by the contemplation of real military action. They will eagerly lead toward a containment option should others fail. But we must all see clearly that, in fact, containment means toleration.

A nuclear weapons-capable Iran that we believe can be contained is one that we are, therefore, prepared to tolerate. This is an illusion and one that makes our task all that much harder. If others—especially Iran, but also including our allies and other coalition partners—come to believe that we would consider ever tolerating a nuclear Iran because it can somehow be contained, then none of our efforts to prevent it will work. This is why a nominee for Secretary of Defense who is less than firm on this key point is, in my opinion, a dangerous choice.

It has been said by Senator Hagel's supporters that whatever his personal views and past statements on these important issues, as Secretary he will toe the line; he will not be making these basic policies himself. In other words, those of us who find his policies objectionable are encouraged to support the nominee despite his views, not because of them.

I cannot bring myself to support a nominee based on the assumption that his own views will become irrelevant once he is under the policy yoke imposed by the White House.

Finally, the most worrisome consequence of confirming Senator Hagel to be Secretary of Defense is something on which the ayatollahs in Tehran and I can agree: The confirmation will tell the Iranian regime that their fear of U.S. military action in Iran is now unjustified. They can rest more comfortably that their pursuit of nuclear weapons is less likely to provoke the military option that, until recently, may have seemed more credible.

The Iranians will, therefore, feel less constrained in pursuing their dan-

gerous nuclear ambitions. That, more than any other reason, is why I am voting no on the Hagel nomination.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

TRIBUTE TO ADELE HALL

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, all of us in our lives from time to time hear of the passing, the death of someone we know. Sometimes it is family, often friends, or perhaps someone we are only vaguely acquainted with. This past week, we learned of the death of a Kansas City resident, Adele Hall. Her passing so personally saddens me because Adele Hall was a person with such optimism and so engaged in improving the lives of others.

Kansas City, in fact, lost one of their greatest champions when Adele Hall passed away. Adele was a longtime resident of Kansas City and was well known and well loved, highly respected for her acts of service and kindness to others. When she wasn't serving on a board of a nonprofit, she was raising funds for a worthy cause or volunteering with children. My guess is that she probably was doing all of those things at once.

Adele, I am sure, had the financial resources to live a life different than in service to others, but she chose to commit her life to making sure others had the chance for the success that she had.

She grew up in Lincoln, NE, and she was—I read today, in her honor, that she was an avid Nebraska fan.

In Nebraska, Adele learned the importance of giving back by watching her own parents volunteer, especially with the Salvation Army. As a young woman, she developed a love for children and later became involved in so many organizations that cared for their health and education and well-being. Adele never lost faith in the potential of a young person's life. One of her greatest passions was working with children at Children's Mercy Hospital. Adele served as chairman of the board there and together with the help of professional golfer Tom Watson, she established the Children's Mercy Golf Classic, which over a quarter of a century has raised more than \$10 million for Children's Mercy. Adele also used her expertise to bless children nationwide through her work as a member of National Commission for Children.

Those boards and that service was important to her, but it was always the personal touch, not just serving on a board and making decisions about a hospital or the children it cared for, but personally caring for the children in the hospital.

Her actions were guided by a belief in the value of each and every individual. She lived out that Biblical teaching "love your neighbor as yourself," through her service as the first woman president of the United Way of Greater