Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just quickly say that I consider it an honor to have had

an opportunity to deal with you both as ambassador and now as

Secretary of State. I am absolutely convinced that on a variety of

the critical issues and notwithstanding some of the most partisan

assaults on American foreign policy over the past 8 years, you have

made a tremendous mark and particularly a mark on elevating to

the level of the Secretary of State a deep concern about humanitarian

questions, human rights issues, questions of genocide, and

have been a fighter within the Administration and in terms of public

opinion as well in galvanizing support for America to play a role

in trying to reduce the carnage, to get involved and not turn away.

I am dying to see—I may die if I see—what the great eminences

surrounding the Republican candidate for president, who love to

criticize our overinvolvement in these issues, will do when these

questions come up in the future. And they will come up. I hope I

don’t have an opportunity to test that proposition, but it is so easy

to pick—but on the big moral questions you come down over and

over again on the right side and fought against those who wanted

to be—have a level of caution that would only allow the carnage

to go on, fought to prevail.

Martin Indyk is a friend. I believe what someone who has served

this country so well is going through is terrible. But my questions

don’t involve Martin Indyk as a person. They involve two specific issues.

The State Department has said, its security people have said

that as the law enforcement agencies and it investigates this issue,

one thing they can state is that there is no evidence of espionage

and there is no evidence of turning over unclassified materials to

unauthorized sources. Given that and given the critical role that he

plays in the peace process that you have devoted so much time to,

the President is so committed to, why can’t he be allowed to serve

his functions as—in the peace process, in that very important but

limited area, dealing with his contacts in the Middle East—he is

a critical part of your team in this area, and he can perform so

many of these functions without regard to his ability to see and

have access to classified materials that I would argue that having

him there hampers our efforts to reach a successful conclusion.

That is the specific question.

The more broad question is the remarkable article in the New

York Times on Monday where some of our most distinguished career

diplomats, some named, some unnamed, but they sounded so

distinguished, Sam Lewis, Mort Abramowitz, others, said if a key

top diplomat had to look at all of his cables and all of the documents,

they would be locked either in the State Department or embassy

20 hours a day; they could not have done their jobs.

Somewhere we have to rethink the reality of how people function

and perform their jobs. Obviously, security is a critical concern.

Some people like to use security as a political assault weapon on

these questions. I am very sensitive to that. But surely there are

some rules of reason that apply here, and I am wondering to what

extent those policies should be revisited.

A recommendation that he be suspended from seeing

classified information?

I am not challenging that.

Is that a bipartisan request or just a Democratic request?

It is only to our side.