

says: Stop talking, Senators, and get down to business. Make a decision once in a while.

Do you know what the vote was yesterday? It was 73 to 17. That means that not only the 57 Democrats who are here but at least 16 of the Republicans joined us and said: Let's get this moving.

How do we find ourselves in this position where the President wants to send the most important civil representative of our Government to a nation where American soldiers' lives are at risk and the Senate wrings its hands and says: Well, maybe we ought to wait a few days; maybe we ought to wait a few weeks; maybe we ought to let this sit over the Easter recess while we eat our Peeps and jellybeans. I do not buy that. This is a critical decision for America's security interests. Sending a diplomat of the skill of Christopher Hill is absolutely essential to protect America's interests, to protect the interests of servicemen, to make certain we have an ongoing relationship with the Iraqis, so that our service men and women can come home safely and Iraq will be stable and safe itself afterward. There is no reason to delay this 1 minute more. We should vote on Christopher Hill's nomination immediately. Why are we denying this? Why are we delaying this when 73 Senators yesterday said: Do it. That is enough. There are enough Senators to get this job done.

President Obama stated a clear goal here: ending our combat mission in Iraq by August 31, 2010. When the combat mission ends, the United States will still leave behind in Iraq the largest American Embassy in the world, where we will maintain a diplomatic mission to help a country still struggling to build stability and democracy. Is there anyone who questions whether we need an ambassador to be in that Embassy? Shouldn't that person have been there weeks ago instead of being delayed by the other side in the Senate?

I do not deny to any Senator the right to speak, express their concerns or reservations about any appointment. I do not deny to any committee of this Senate the opportunity to have a hearing, which Ambassador Hill did have. All of that happened in the regular order. At the end of the day yesterday, 73 Democratic and Republican Senators said: Get on with it. Still, we languish over this nomination at this very moment. The military leaders, American military leaders of Iraq, have been begging this Senate to do its job and send an ambassador who can complement the fine work of General Odierno in Iraq. We continue to delay.

The President's plan for Iraq is measured and thoughtful and will bring a resolution to this war. It sends a message to the Iraqi political leadership that they have to take responsibility for their own future. It takes into consideration the concerns and recommendations of the senior military

leaders regarding the time for the drawdown and the manner in which it will be implemented. It frees resources for the real battle against al-Qaida in Afghanistan, which was the source of the 9/11 attacks. It includes comprehensive diplomatic engagement with all of the countries of the region not only on the future of Iraq but on other important regional challenges. It begins to put an end to the extraordinary cost to America and American families in terms of lives and dollars that the Iraqi war has entailed.

Our military men and women have served heroically in Iraq. I have been there to visit them. I have been several times in my home State to see our Guard units take off and join the conflict. I have been there to welcome them home, attended the funerals. We could not ask for anything more. They have given us so much, and they continue to do so as we meet in the safety of the Senate Chamber here in the Capitol. More than 4,200 Americans have been killed, 165 from my home State of Illinois. When the war started, I said I would write a note to the families who lost soldiers from my State. Little did I dream that years later I would still be signing those notes, as I did yesterday. Thousands have suffered serious physical and psychological injuries. That is the real cost of this war. Civilian experts in and out of the Government have also served with distinction and paid with their lives. Thousands of innocent Iraqis have died. I have seen firsthand the dangerously hard work our soldiers face.

We owe them gratitude and admiration, but we also owe them our best efforts to make certain we bring this war in Iraq to an end in the best possible way. President Obama has the strategy, but to implement this strategy we need an experienced ambassador in Iraq without any further delay.

I wonder what would have happened under the previous administration if the Democrats had held up a key appointment of an ambassador to Iraq in the midst of a war. Well, I can tell you what would have happened: The right-wing radio would have gone crazy, talking about endangering American servicemen by not filling this critical position. We would have speeches on the floor about shirking our responsibility and that we cannot go home for a break until we send a full complement of our best and brightest to represent America in Iraq. I can almost predict that would have happened if we had been so shortsighted under the previous administration as to hold back a career diplomat such as Christopher Hill.

Well, it has happened here, and it is happened for too long. It is unforgivable. It is inexcusable. Members have had plenty of time to give their speeches, to express their concerns, even to vote no, which is their right to do if they believe this man is not the right person for the job. But it is time for us to get on with this important mission.

We owe it to those men and women who are risking their lives in Iraq. We owe it to all who have served there and to the American people who have sustained this war, as expensive as it has been in terms of life and costs. It is time for us to stop wasting time. It is time for us to fill this position and send Christopher Hill to be the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BURRIS).

NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER R. HILL TO BE AMBASSADOR TO IRAQ—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I trust we are not in a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business and that Senator BROWNBACK be recognized following my presentation.

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

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Chris Hill nomination to be Ambassador to Iraq. I am opposed to that nomination. A number of issues have been raised on this nomination I want to talk about to try to put some factual setting associated with that.

First, though, I wish to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement a Jerusalem Post online edition article dated yesterday that I read extensively from in my first presentation regarding the 65th anniversary of the escape from Auschwitz. I ask unanimous consent to have that article printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. I want to note for my colleagues, I read extensively from this article and did not cite that during my initial presentation. I want to make sure they know this came from that reporter and that we were putting that in.

Second, there has been a lot of discussion here about: OK, we have to get this person confirmed. We have to get him out, and it is a terrible shame it has not taken place to date.

I agree we need an ambassador to Iraq. There is no question about that. I appreciate my colleagues' concern about getting an ambassador to Iraq. I would note, there is one who does not have the controversy this one has who was offered the post initially, who accepted it, and then somehow this was mysteriously withdrawn. So there was a person we could have gone forward with, who had accepted it, and for some reason it was pulled back.

Yesterday, CNN was talking to General Zinni, retired General Zinni, and I wish to quote from this report from yesterday.

Zinni told CNN Monday he hasn't been given any explanation about why the offer he got in January for the post—

This is U.S. Ambassador to Iraq—which he accepted was abruptly taken back. Zinni confirmed in an e-mail that he was asked to take the job by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and even congratulated by Vice President JOE BIDEN, but then the offer was revoked and extended to Hill, a development Zinni says he heard on the news. Zinni is a retired four-star Marine general and former head of Central Command. Like President Barack Obama, he was an early critic of the Iraqi war.

He would seem like a likely—logical, actually—pick for our Ambassador to Iraq, putting forward somebody whom I could have seen supporting. He is knowledgeable of the region and not with a history of deception toward this body or of problems dealing with human rights issues.

To my colleagues who put forward: We have to get this done, it is a terrible tragedy you are holding this up, well, why didn't you nominate somebody such as Retired General Zinni, or why did you pick him and then pull him back? That might be a more interesting note to find out. It would be interesting to me, anyway and, I would hope, to a number of other people.

The reason I have trouble with this nominee is because of this nominee's past performance, lack of concern on human rights, and then we are giving him this great, huge assignment for the United States, and I don't agree with that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement as well.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

There has also been a charge that Ambassador Hill simply didn't raise the human rights issues because the Bush administration wouldn't let him do this and that you needed to look up the ladder, not at Ambassador Hill on this. I can tell my colleagues from my personal conversations with President Bush, he was deeply concerned about human rights. He loathed Kim Jong-Il because of the human rights issues more than any other. Those were his statements. I personally had two direct conversations at length with the President about this.

The idea that somehow Chris Hill couldn't do this because the President and his apparatus wouldn't agree to it raises some major questions about that charge because it certainly wasn't the President who was saying anything such as that. I think that one is patently false on its face.

There is also this unfortunate history that Chris Hill has of diminishing and playing down human rights issues. There are human rights issues in Iraq as well, and there are going to be as we go forward in that region. To have somebody who consistently has played these down, ignored them, papered them over, that raises real questions to me.

To support that, I wish to put forward as well some thoughts from others of my colleagues who are concerned about human rights. I have cited my own discussion with him. I have cited previously, but I think this bears putting forward to my colleagues again, Jay Lefkowitz was our North Korean Human Rights Special Envoy, who was appointed pursuant to the North Korean Human Rights Act that this body passed and the President signed, and Jay Lefkowitz wrote to me:

At no point during my tenure as special envoy for human rights in North Korea, either before or after July 31, 2008, did Chris Hill or anyone acting on his behalf invite me to participate in any six party talks; any, none, not at all. Jay.

This is after Chris Hill had stated in open testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, when I was asking him:

Will you state that the special envoy will be invited to all future negotiating sessions with North Korea?

Ambassador Hill responds:

I would be happy to invite him to all future negotiating sessions with North Korea.

This is on the Record. This is Jay Lefkowitz' statement afterward.

I ask unanimous consent that both of those be printed in the RECORD after my statement.

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

(See exhibits 3 and 4.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, a number of my colleagues will know Congressman FRANK WOLF from the House side as a wonderful human rights advocate and has been for a number of years. He is deeply concerned about human rights issues overall. He has worked these issues for a long period of time. He is a fabulous man on these topics. He wrote Ambassador Hill on February 5, 2009, this to Ambassador Hill on his nomination to go into Iraq:

While I do not question your qualifications as a diplomat, I must be frank in telling you that I was often disappointed in your approach to diplomacy with North Korea; specifically, your marginalization and oftentimes seeming utter neglect of human rights.

In a Washington Post piece Michael Gerson described your shaping of America's North Korea policy in this way—

Now, Michael Gerson was on the inside of the Bush White House and cites

to Ambassador Hill as shaping United States-North Korea policy, and Michael Gerson writes this:

Hill has been a tireless advocate of preemptive diplomatic concessions—

preemptive diplomatic concessions—and the exclusion of human rights issues from reports and negotiations.

That is the end of the quote from Gerson.

It is difficult to know how much the policy you were pursuing simply reflected the President and the Secretary's aims or whether you were in fact the chief architect and advocate of this approach. Regardless, while Iraq and North Korea are obviously two very different countries, it gives me pause as I consider the human rights challenges confronting Iraq's ethno-religious minorities who are increasingly under siege.

This is taking place in Iraq today. We have all these human rights abuses that are boiling in Iraq today, and now we want to send a guy who has a highly questionable record on human rights in his last assignment.

FRANK WOLF goes on:

More than 500,000 Christians, or roughly 50 percent, have fled Iraq since 2003. Even though Christians make up only 3 percent of the country's population, according to the U.N. High Commission for Refugees, they comprise nearly half of all refugees leaving Iraq. As Iraq has continued to stabilize, these minority populations, including the aging Christian community—some of whom still speak Aramaic—is dwindling and increasingly vulnerable to marginalization and increasing attacks, of the sort we witnessed in Mosul this past fall.

This is from Congressman FRANK WOLF.

We have a history of bad human rights in dealing with North Korea and we have a bubbling problem, a current problem in Iraq, and we send Chris Hill who has had big difficulty in dealing with it.

I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Finally, in this tranche, there was a letter sent—this is on January 28 of 2005 and it was to the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the U.N., our contact point with North Korea diplomatically. It was addressed to Ambassador Pak. It states:

This letter is to inform you and your government of the distress with which the undersigned Members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation received the finding from the Seoul Central District Prosecutor's Office on December 14, 2004 that South Korean citizen and U.S. permanent resident Reverend Kim Dong-Shik had been abducted by agents of your government in northeast China in January of 2000 and taken forcibly into North Korea. Your government regretably has, by its own admission, been involved in the abduction of a number of Japanese citizens as well as an even greater number of South Korean citizens.

Reverend Kim Dong-Shik, as you may be aware, is the spouse of Mrs. Young Hwa Kim

of Chicago, Illinois, and is the parent of U.S. citizens, one of whom is currently residing in Skokie, Illinois. Citizens from a Korean-American church in the Chicago area have also raised this matter as an issue of grave concern and requested congressional assistance in ascertaining the facts behind the disappearance and current whereabouts of Reverend Kim. In pursuant of these issues, Mrs. Kim and a delegation from Illinois will be visiting Capitol Hill in the near future.

The successful resolution of this case, therefore, is of critical importance to us—

This is the Illinois delegation—

both because of the constituent interest involved as well as because it is a case involving the most fundamental of human rights. Reverend Kim, in his selfless efforts to assist refugees escaping in an underground network to third countries, brings to mind two great heroes held in high esteem in the United States. The first is Ms. Harriet Tubman, who established an underground railroad allowing for the escape from slavery of those held in bondage before President Lincoln issued the emancipation proclamation, the second is the Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg who, during the dark days of the world conflict against fascism in the Second World War, rescued Jewish refugees trapped in Hungary. We view Reverend Kim Dong-Shik as also being a hero who assisted with the escape of the powerless and forgotten.

We, therefore, wish to inform the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that we will not support the removal of your government from the State Department's list of State sponsors of terrorism until such time, among other reasons, as a full accounting is provided to the Kim family regarding the fate of Reverend Kim Dong-Shik following his abduction into North Korea five years ago.

This is signed by U.S. Senators RICHARD J. DURBIN and Barack Obama. They signed this letter to our permanent representative, the permanent representative of North Korea to the U.N. on January 28 of 2005.

Well, those sanctions are now lifted. The guy who pushed for the lifting of them is now being pushed to be the Ambassador to Iraq, and Rev. Kim Dong-Shik—it is still not known where he is. He is still somewhere abducted, hopefully alive—we don't know—in North Korea.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 6.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. When people say this is being held up and it is irresponsible and you shouldn't do this, I am just quoting a number of Members of Congress. I am just quoting the President. I am just pointing to a human rights situation that our Ambassador to Iraq will go into, and saying, isn't this reason enough to go with somebody such as General Zinni instead of Ambassador Hill in this situation?

Also, we haven't been able to get information from the State Department. I had asked for the instructions they had given to Ambassador Hill. He had stated in committee testimony here that at one point in time he called it "inaudible" in the negotiations, and in that "inaudible" he made a change. We

wanted to find out what State Department instructions were to him, or what they were to him on human rights issues, and that hasn't been received by my office. We haven't been able to get those back.

A number of my colleagues don't remember, or they don't cite to the period of time that Ambassador Hill was working on the Korean desk, but they do cite to what he did in Bosnia and say, OK, he was a successful diplomat, he did this; North Korea is tough, we are going to ignore that; and now let's put him in Iraq. Well, there are some real questionable records of what he did in the situation in the Balkans and in Bosnia. Here I have an article, dated March 22, of this year. I think it is very interesting and quite troubling. This is about one of the people who is charged with war crimes and his dealings with Ambassador Hill. I am going to quote from this article and enter it into the RECORD.

Every time Radovan Karadzic, the onetime Bosnian Serb leader, appears in court on war crimes charges, he has hammered on one recurring claim: a senior American official pledged that he would never be standing there being charged with war crimes.

The official, Richard C. Holbrooke, now a special envoy on Afghanistan and Pakistan for the Obama administration, has repeatedly denied promising Mr. Karadzic immunity from prosecution in exchange for abandoning power after the Bosnian war.

But the rumor persists, and different versions that recently emerged that line up with Mr. Karadzic's assertion, including a new historical study published by Purdue University in Indiana.

Charles W. Ingrao, the study's co-editor, said that three senior State Department officials, one of them retired, and several other people with knowledge of Mr. Holbrooke's activities, told him that Mr. Holbrooke assured Mr. Karadzic in July 1996 that he would not be pursued by the international war crimes tribunal in The Hague if he left politics.

Mr. Karadzic had already been charged by the tribunal with genocide and other crimes against civilians.

Now, you say, OK, that is charging Mr. Holbrooke, but let's see what the report writers go on to say about this.

The Purdue University study, "Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies: A Scholars' Initiative", instructed his principal assistant, Christopher Hill, to draft the memorandum to be signed by Karadzic, committing him to give up power—

in exchange for not being charged with war crimes.

The author of the study said Mr. Holbrooke used Slobodan Milosevic, the then Serbian leader, and other Serbian officials as intermediaries to convey the promise of immunity and to reach the deal with Mr. Karadzic. "The agreement almost came to grief when Holbrooke vigorously refused Karadzic's demand, and Hill's appeal, that he affix his signature to it," the study says, citing unidentified State Department sources.

Chris Hill's name again.

The study, the product of 8 years of research by historians, jurists, and social scientists from all sides of the con-

flict, was an effort to reconcile disparate views of the wars that tore the former Yugoslavia apart in the 1990s, Mr. Ingrao said.

The former official said Mr. Karadzic wanted written assurance that he would not be pursued for war crimes and refused to sign without them.

"Holbrooke told the Serbs, 'You can give him my word he won't be pursued,' but Holbrooke refused to sign anything," the official said. Mr. Holbrooke could make that promise because he knew that American and other western militaries in Bosnia were not then making arrests, the official said.

Neither Mr. Hill nor Mr. Goldberg responded to requests for interviews for this article.

Here is another insertion of Mr. Hill on a huge problem with human rights. This one in the Yugoslav, the Balkans theater. There it is again—North Korea, the Balkans, and we have a brewing situation taking place in Iraq, and we are going to send him there.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 7.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I am doing that so my colleagues and others who study this can look at the factual studies we have in examining what is taking place here.

A number of my colleagues say the North Korean situation is not relevant to the debate we are in today. I don't know why it is not. When we run for office, people go look at our backgrounds and say what did they do in their past job to see if we ought to elect them for this one. People don't kind of walk into the Senate. There is an examination process that the public goes through. I don't know why we would not want to examine somebody to see their track record.

Some have suggested that the human rights issue kind of popped up in North Korea, and that we learned at the last minute, so that Chris Hill had to deal with this at a quick point so he should have had set it aside to get the full deal.

This is a February 4, 2004 article on washingtonpost.com. This is written by Anne Apolebaum. The title is "Auschwitz Under Our Noses."

As I stated, it is Holocaust Remembrance Day today. This article talks about North Korea and what is taking place there in 2004. So this didn't just pop up. There had been a documentary put forward by the BBC describing the atrocities in North Korea. I will read one section that is incredible. It says this:

Look, for example, at the international reaction to a documentary, aired last Sunday night on the BBC. It described atrocities committed in the concentration camps of contemporary North Korea, where, it was alleged, chemical weapons are tested on prisoners. Central to the film was the testimony of Kwon Hyuk, a former administrator at a North Korean camp.

This is what the administrator said:

I witnessed a whole family being tested on suffocating gas and dying in the gas chamber.

He witnessed that.

He said:

The parents, son, and a daughter. The parents were vomiting and dying, but till the very last moment they tried to save the kids by doing mouth-to-mouth breathing.

The article goes on:

The documentary also included testimony from a former prisoner, who says she saw 50 women die after being deliberately fed poison. And it included documents smuggled out of the country that seemed to sentence a prisoner to a camp "for the purpose of human experimentation."

The author writes this at the end, and this is the whole point of this:

Later—in 10 years, or in 60—it will surely turn out that quite a lot was known in 2004 about the camps of North Korea. It will turn out that information collected by various human rights groups, South Korean churches, oddball journalists, and spies added up to a damning and largely accurate picture of an evil regime. It will also turn out that there were things that could have been done, approaches the South Korean government might have made, diplomatic channels the U.S. Government might have opened, pressure the Chinese might have applied.

Historians in Asia, Europe, and here will finger various institutions, just as we do now, and demand they justify their past actions. And no one will be able to understand how it was possible that we knew of the existence of the gas chambers but failed to act.

That is what I am asking. My goodness. This has been going on, and I tried to push Chris Hill about it for years and nothing happened, and I got an agreement in open testimony in a hearing, and nothing happened after that. But now let's move him to Iraq and give him that account.

I ask unanimous consent this article be printed in the RECORD after my statement.

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

(See exhibit 8.)

Mr. KERRY. Will the Senator yield for a procedural question?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Yes.

Mr. KERRY. I ask my colleague, if he has a moment, to see whether we can set a time for the vote with respect to this issue.

Mr. BROWNBACK. If I may respond through the Chair, I have contacted colleagues. We are still confirming at what time they can speak. Several colleagues want to speak. We are working on that right now.

Mr. KERRY. Does the Senator have a sense of when we could try to come to some arrangement? A lot of Senators on both sides of the aisle are trying to arrange schedules, and the majority leader is trying to deal with the question of the legislative schedule. If we can get a sense of that—I know the Senator is trying to get at it. I think if we could pin this down, that would be helpful. If he could give me a sense of how many Senators, when, and if we will lock in their times and then lock in a vote.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I am contacting colleagues now. We don't have that officially tied down yet so that I can respond at this time. I appreciate my colleague from Massachusetts saying that, as I understand, there will be a hearing on North Korean—not necessarily on the atrocities, although I hope it will be covered, but also on possible sanctions on North Korea. I appreciate that is being worked on to address some of these concerns. I will be raising, as well—while my colleague is here—that we not put in a supplemental bill support for the North Korean regime that is beyond humanitarian aid, particularly as these things are surfacing now. I realize that is not the Senator's committee, but I want to make my colleagues, who know the situation well, aware of these points that I will be raising.

Mr. KERRY. Let me say that every one of us shares the outrage at the type of government and the way in which the people of North Korea are oppressed. I commend the Senator from Kansas for calling the country's attention and the world's attention and the Senate's at this moment to it. We will have a hearing on May 6. It will be a comprehensive hearing on North Korea. It will involve all of the issues with respect to North Korea. We welcome that. That is an appropriate role for us.

But it is also appropriate for us to try to get this nominee a time certain. He would like to leave for Iraq tomorrow. So we wish, if we can, to have a sense of the timing on the vote. If we can get an agreement here, maybe I could—how many Senators are planning to speak on the Senator's side of the aisle?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, we have three who are lined up to speak. There are Senators MCCAIN and KYL, who have scheduling issues later in the day. That is what I am trying to get firmed up. I am not trying to delay my colleagues.

Mr. KERRY. I understood that Senator MCCAIN was going to try to speak at 3:30, which is about 35 minutes from now. We are prepared not to have any further speakers on our side.

I will propound a request. I ask unanimous consent that we allow the Senator from Kansas to control the time, but for, say, 10 minutes between now and the hour of 5 o'clock, and that the vote be at 5 o'clock. I ask for an order to that effect.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I have to object at this time. I simply don't know when Senator KYL can speak, and he desires to speak. Until I can determine that, I cannot agree for others of my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KERRY. I respect that, but I also know how the Senate works; I have 26 years here. I will come back. I have a meeting going on now, but I will be back in about 20 minutes. I hope we can find Senator KYL between now and

then, pin down the time for him, and get an agreement. I think it is important for the Senate to get its business done. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BROWNBACK. If we can locate him and if there are not others.

Mr. KERRY. If we cannot contact a member of the Senate who is in the leadership—surely we can find one of the leaders of the Senate in 20 minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I have said what I know.

Mr. KERRY. I will be back at a quarter after, and I hope we can propound an agreement at that time. I thank the Senator for the interruption.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I want to speak about another issue, because this caught a lot of what is involved here. This is a 2004 article called "An Auschwitz in Korea." I had hoped my colleague could stay and hear this, but he has to leave.

This is to the point raised by a number of people that this was kind of quick and the problem with human rights was not known as an issue in North Korea, and that we don't know about it. Chris Hill steps in and he has to make the call that we are not going to pursue human rights, but we are going to go completely after the nuclear issue.

This article is by Jeff Jacoby from the Boston Globe. He puts it so well, because it is to the point we have here. He writes this:

Does "never again" simply mean "never again will Germans kill Jews in Europe between 1939 and 1945?"

Is that what "never again" means? Obviously, that is not the case. We are not going to let this sort of thing happen again on Holocaust Remembrance Day.

That brings us to North Korea. In 2004, this author writes this. This was in the press:

It is not exactly news that the Communist regime of Kim Jong Il has sent millions of North Koreans to early graves. Estimates back to 1998 were that as many as 800,000 people were dying in North Korea each year from starvation and malnutrition caused by Kim's ruthless and irrational policies. World Vision, a Christian relief organization, calculated that 1 million to 2 million North Koreans had been killed by "a full-scale famine" largely of Pyongyang's creation.

They created the famine and people die off who don't support the regime. We have heard about that system before, and some of the purges that took place in the Soviet Union.

The article also says:

Nor is it breaking news that North Korea operates a vicious prison gulag—"not unlike the worst labor camps built by Mao and Stalin in the last century," as NBC News reported more than a year ago. Some 200,000 men, women, and children are held in these slave-labor camps; hundreds of thousands of others have perished in them over the years. Some of the camps are so hellish that 20 percent or more of their prisoners die from torture and abuse each year. The dead can be of any age: North Korea's longstanding policy is to imprison not only those accused of such "crimes" as practicing Christianity [one of

the major crimes] or complaining about North Korean life, but their entire families, including grandparents and grandchildren. The policy there is if one member of the family complains, 3 generations are taken. This is the way they then operate these prison camps.

I want to show a picture of one of the prison camps that looks organized along the lines that Auschwitz was organized. This is taken by Google Earth. They are organized like the Auschwitz ones. The difference here is that they group you by families, so they have taken three generations when one is opposed. They organize this and it is a death camp. Kwon Hyuk was quoted, saying:

I witnessed a whole family being tested on suffocating gas and dying in the gas chamber.

The article says:

The speaker is Kwon Hyuk, a former North Korean intelligence agent and a one-time administrator at Camp 22, the country's largest concentration camp.

We have a picture of camp 22. I will show you what he is talking about here. It is the largest camp. The testimony was heard on a television documentary that aired on BBC, which I mentioned.

Here we have a situation—this writer is writing—of “Gas chambers. Poisoned food. Torture. The murder of whole families. Massive death tolls. How much more do we need to know about North Korea's crimes before we act to stop them? How many more victims will be fed into the gas chambers before we cry out, ‘never again!’”—and we mean it?”

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article titled “An Auschwitz in Korea.”

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From boston.com, Feb. 8, 2004]

AN AUSCHWITZ IN KOREA

(By Jeff Jacoby)

TWO WORDS—“never again”—sum up the most important lesson that civilized men and women were supposed to have learned from the 20th century. It is forbidden to keep silent, forbidden to look the other way, when tyrants embark on genocide and slaughter—if Auschwitz and Kolyma and the Cambodian killing fields taught us nothing else, they taught us that.

Or so, at any rate, we like to tell ourselves. As Samantha Power discovered upon returning to the United States after two years as a war correspondent in Bosnia, the lesson of “never again” is invoked far more often than it is applied.

“Everywhere I went,” Power recalled in a speech at Swarthmore College in 2002, “I heard ‘never again.’ Steven Spielberg’s ‘Schindler’s List’ had been a smash hit. The Holocaust Museum had opened on the Mall in Washington. College seminars were taught on the ‘lessons’ of the singular crime of the 20th century. But why, I wondered, had nobody applied those lessons to the atrocities of the 1990s: the systematic murder of 200,000 Bosnian civilians in Europe between 1992 and 1995 and the extermination of some 800,000 Rwandan Tutsi in 1994.

“Did ‘never again’ simply mean ‘never again will Germans kill Jews in Europe between 1939 and 1945?’”

Power went on to write “A Problem From Hell,” her Pulitzer Prize-winning account of

America's failure to intervene in the genocides of the 20th century. The book was hugely and deservedly praised. It made clear, as no book had before, how much Americans knew about some of the most horrific massacres of the last century even as they were happening, and how little we did to stop them—or even, in most cases, condemn them.

Which brings us to North Korea.

It is not exactly news that the communist regime of Kim Jong II has sent millions of North Koreans to early graves. Estimates back in 1998 were that as many as 800,000 people were dying in North Korea each year from starvation and malnutrition caused by Kim's ruthless and irrational policies. World Vision, a Christian relief organization, calculated that 1 million to 2 million North Koreans had been killed by “a full-scale famine” largely of Pyongyang's creation.

Nor is it breaking news that North Korea operates a vicious prison gulag—“not unlike the worst labor camps built by Mao and Stalin in the last century,” as NBC News reported more than a year ago. Some 200,000 men, women, and children are held in these slave-labor camps; hundreds of thousands of others have perished in them over the years. Some of the camps are so hellish that 20 percent or more of their prisoners die from torture and abuse each year. The dead can be of any age: North Korea's longstanding policy is to imprison not only those accused of such “crimes” as practicing Christianity or complaining about North Korean life, but their entire families, including grandparents and grandchildren.

And, of course, it is widely known that Kim is openly pursuing nuclear weapons, has fired missiles capable of reaching Japan, and controls one of the largest military forces on earth.

All of this is hideous enough, and more than sufficient reason for making Kim's ouster—and his prosecution for crimes against humanity—an explicit goal of the United States. But now comes something new.

“I witnessed a whole family being tested on suffocating gas and dying in the gas chamber. The parents, a son, and a daughter.” The speaker is Kwon Hyuk, a former North Korean intelligence agent and a one-time administrator at Camp 22, the country's largest concentration camp. His testimony was heard on a television documentary that aired last week on the BBC. “The parents were vomiting and dying, but till the very last moment they tried to save the kids by doing mouth-to-mouth breathing.”

Like other communist officials, Kwon was not bothered by what he saw. “I felt that they thoroughly deserved such a death. Because all of us were led to believe that all the bad things that were happening to North Korea were their fault. . . . Under the society and the regime I was in at the time, I only felt that they were the enemies. So I felt no sympathy or pity for them at all.”

Soon Ok-lee, who spent seven years in another North Korean camp, described the use of prisoners as guinea pigs for biochemical weapons.

“An officer ordered me to select 50 healthy female prisoners,” she testified. “One of the guards handed me a basket full of soaked cabbage, told me not to eat it, but to give it to the 50 women. I gave them out and heard a scream. . . . They were all screaming and vomiting blood. All who ate the cabbage leaves started violently vomiting blood and screaming with pain. It was hell. In less than 20 minutes, they were dead.”

Gas chambers. Poisoned food. Torture. The murder of whole families. Massive death tolls. How much more do we need to know about North Korea's crimes before we act to stop them? How many more victims will be fed into the gas chambers before we cry out “never again!”—and mean it?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, this is Camp 22. You can see it outlined, the size and scale. We have some other camp pictures that show this. I want to make sure everybody knows that on Holocaust Remembrance Day we have pictures of this going on. This is not some secret information. This is on Google Earth. Look it up yourself.

This picture is of outside the camp, the westbound coal train from Camp 22 where they do coal mining, slave labor where people go in, but nobody comes out. They are worked to death, starved to death.

There are a couple books on this point—“The Aquariums of Pyongyang” was written by a survivor and “Eyes of Tailless Animals” was written by Soon Ok Lee. Those are a couple books people can look at.

This is another picture from Google Earth. These are people in the concentration camp, this shows outside the fence. About 200,000 people we believe are in concentration camps in North Korea. Here is another picture, one of a concentration camp. I urge my colleagues to get a briefing on this situation so they can look at the high resolution information we have access to, not just Google Earth. Google Earth is useful for this setting.

Here is another concentration camp. Here is the execution site in this particular camp. These have all been run by refugees who have been able to make their way out and now give the information of here is what took place in various places. Here are the coal mine entrances marked No. 1; prisoner housing, No. 2; the execution site, No. 3; No. 4 is a rifle range. I don't know if they use individuals as target practice.

This picture shows the location of various prison camps of the gulag that is in North Korea that we chose to ignore in our six-party talks. These are the selected North Korean prison camp locations, where they are around the country. We know what is taking place in that country. I raise all of these points to point out that we cannot continue to allow this to take place.

I want to raise one final issue. My colleagues have been very generous to allow me to put this forward. I have to do this on this day, Holocaust Remembrance Day, when we are about to confirm an ambassador who looked past all of this while he was there.

We will soon consider the supplemental appropriations bill. That will be coming up shortly before this body. Last year, this body inserted into the supplemental appropriations bill a waiver to waive the Glenn amendment sanctions against North Korea. The Glenn amendment sanctions do not provide for a Presidential waiver. The Congress has to affirmatively act to waive Glenn amendment sanctions. The Congress did, and that allowed us to send—as the Soviet Union used to send to the North Koreans only we are sending it now. I ask my colleagues not to put in this year's supplemental Glenn amendment waivers and not to put in this year's supplemental funding for North Korea beyond humanitarian

assistance. Yes to humanitarian assistance because people are starving to death, but no to fuel, oil aid, no to other aid because they tested missiles in defiance of us and the United Nations. They are being investigated now for sending nuclear material to Iran. They have captured two American journalists and still have them there. They have unaccounted for other people they have captured. They have this incredible human rights gulag system that is tragic and taking place right now. They are forcing people to walk into China, many of whom are women who walk into China to get food and are taken for human trafficking and as concubines.

Let's not continue a regime that is a disaster, that is a horrific situation, and we are allowing this to happen.

Let's not do that in the supplemental. Let's not approve Chris Hill moving on after two big problems on human rights.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this nominee and to not give further funds and aid and waiving sanctions on North Korea.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Jerusalem Post, Apr. 20, 2009]
THE TEENAGER WHO EXPOSED AUSCHWITZ
(By Rafael Medoff)

This month marks the 65th anniversary of a daring escape from Auschwitz, by a teenager who then revealed the truth about the death camp—only to be ignored by the Allied leadership.

In March 1944, the Germans occupied Hungary and began preparing to deport that country's Jews—numbering approximately 750,000—to Auschwitz. A 19-year-old prisoner named Rudolf Vrba, together with fellow-inmate Alfred Wetzler, decided to do something that almost nobody had ever done before: escape from Auschwitz. They were determined to alert the world about the doom that Hungarian Jews would soon face.

On April 7, Vrba and Wetzler slipped away from their slave labor battalion and hid in a hollowed-out woodpile near the edge of the camp. On the advice of Soviet prisoners of war, the fugitives sprinkled the area with tobacco and gasoline, which confused the German dogs that were used to search for them.

On their second day in the woodpile, Vrba and Wetzler heard Allied warplanes overhead. "They came closer and closer—then bombs began to crunch not far away." Vrba later recalled in his searing memoir *I Cannot Forgive*. "Our pulses quickened. Were they going to bomb the camp? Was the secret out? . . . Was this the end of Auschwitz?"

THE ALLIED PLANES were actually bombing German oil factories in and around the Auschwitz complex. The idea of bombing the death camp had not yet been proposed to the Allied leadership, and details such as the location of the gas chambers and crematoria were not yet known to the Allied war command. But that was about to change.

On April 10, in the dead of night, Vrba and Wetzler emerged from the woodpile and began an 11-day, 80-mile trek to Slovakia. There they met with Jewish leaders and dictated a 30-page report that came to be known as the "Auschwitz Protocols." It included details of the mass-murder process, maps pinpointing the gas chambers and crematoria and warnings of the impending slaughter of Hungary's Jews.

"One million Hungarian [Jews] are going to die," Vrba told them. "Auschwitz is ready for them. But if you tell them now, they will rebel. They will never go to the ovens."

A COPY of the report was given to Rudolf Kastner, a Budapest Jewish leader. Instead of publicizing the information, Kastner negotiated a deal that involved bribing the Germans to permit a train with 1,684 of his relatives, friends and Hungarian Jewish leaders to leave the country. Kastner's action became the centerpiece of a controversial trial in Israel after the war.

Another copy of Vrba's Auschwitz Protocols was given to Rabbi Michael Dov Weissmandl, a rescue activist in Bratislava, who then wrote the first known appeal for the use of Allied air power to disrupt the mass murder. Weissmandl's plea to the Allies to bomb the railroad lines between Hungary and Auschwitz reached the Roosevelt administration in June.

Assistant secretary of war John McCloy responded that the request was "impracticable" because it would require "diversion of considerable air support essential to the success of our forces now engaged in decisive operations." He also claimed the War Department's position was based on "a study" of the issue. But no evidence of such a study has ever been found by researchers. In reality, McCloy's position was based on the War Department's standing policy that no military resources should be allocated for "rescuing victims of enemy oppression."

VRBA'S REPORT convinced the Jewish Agency leadership in Palestine to change its position on bombing Auschwitz because they believed it was a labor camp, not a death camp. But after receiving the Auschwitz Protocols in June, agency officials lobbied British, American and Soviet officials to bomb the camp or the railways leading to it. Their requests were rebuffed.

Most important, a condensed version of the Auschwitz Protocols reached the U.S. government's War Refugee Board in June. It helped galvanize the board to mobilize international pressure on Hungary to halt the deportations to Auschwitz. Although that effort came too late for the more than 400,000 Hungarian Jews who had been shipped to their doom, it did spare the 200,000-plus who were still alive in Budapest.

The full version of the Vrba report was actually held up in Switzerland for three months by U.S. diplomats who regarded it as low priority. And when the report finally reached Washington in October, the Office of War Information opposed distributing it; OWI director Elmer Davis claimed the report was actually part of a Nazi conspiracy to "create contempt for the [Jewish] inmates" by showing that the Jews were not resisting their killers.

Fortunately, Davis and his cockamamie theories were too late to blunt the impact of the Auschwitz Protocols. The Hungarian deportations had been stopped, and Rudolf Vrba and Alfred Wetzler had played a significant role in bringing that about.

EXHIBIT 2

PREFERENCE FOR HILL OVER ZINNI REMAINS A MYSTERY

(By Dana Bash)

WASHINGTON (CNN)—Chris Hill is slowly overcoming GOP opposition that has delayed his nomination as U.S. ambassador to Iraq, but it's still unclear why the Obama administration revoked the offer they gave to someone else first—General Anthony Zinni.

Zinni told CNN Monday he hasn't been given any explanation about why the offer he got in January for the post, which he accepted, was abruptly taken back.

Zinni confirmed in an e-mail that he was asked to take the job by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and even congratulated by Vice President Joe Biden. But then, the offer was revoked and extended to Hill—a development Zinni says he heard on the news.

Zinni is a retired four-star Marine general and former head of Central Command. Like

President Barack Obama, he was an early critic of the Iraq war.

Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-South Carolina, told CNN he would have wholeheartedly supported Zinni for position because of his knowledge of the region. Graham, along with Sens. John McCain, R-Arizona, and Sam Brownback, R-Kansas, have led the opposition to Hill, citing his "controversial legacy" as point man in the six-nation talks aimed at dismantling North Korea's nuclear program and his lack of experience in the Middle East.

Graham, however, voted Monday to move Hill's nomination forward, while McCain did not vote. Brownback voted against Hill.

A State Department spokesman had no comment on Zinni.

A senior Democratic congressional source, who would not be quoted speaking about private deliberations, called the decision to nominate Hill over Zinni one of the "great mysteries" of the early days of the Obama administration.

EXHIBIT 3

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2009.

Mr. JAY P. LEFKOWITZ, P.C.,
Kirkland & Ellis LLP, Citigroup Center, New York, NY.

DEAR JAY: Christopher Hill testified today before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In response to a question by Senator Lugar, he failed to specifically address whether he invited you to participate in the Six Party Talks to address North Korean human rights. As you recall, in his testimony before the Senate Armed Service Committee on July 31, 2008, he promised to invite you to participate in all future negotiation sessions, without qualifying the nature of those sessions.

Based on my knowledge of the situation, I believe he violated his commitment. Can you please respond to me as to whether or not Christopher Hill or anyone acting on his behalf invited you to the Six Party Talks subsequent to July 31, 2008?

I look forward to your swift reply, and appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

SAM BROWNBAC,
United States Senator.

DEAR SENATOR BROWNBAC: At no point during my tenure as Special Envoy for Human Rights in North Korea, either before or after July 31, 2008, did Chris Hill or anyone acting on his behalf invite me to participate in any Six Party Talks.

JAY.

EXHIBIT 4

Senator BROWNBAC. I want to, because my time will be narrow here: will you state that the Special Envoy will be invited to all future negotiating sessions with North Korea?

Ambassador HILL. I would be happy to invite him to all future negotiating sessions with North Korea.

Senator BROWNBAC. Thank you.

Mr. Ambassador, you noted this earlier, that there are political gulags and concentration camps in North Korea. Will you state that any prospect of normalization with North Korea is contingent upon the regime shutting down the political gulags and concentration camps?

Ambassador HILL. I can say to you, Senator, that we will definitely raise these issues as an element of the normalization process. I'm not in a position at my level to state to you today what the specific conditions of normalization were, but they will be raised as part of that and clearly, we will be looking for more satisfactory answers on this.

Senator BROWNBAC. Mr. Ambassador, the Illinois delegation in total in a letter dated

in 2005—noted the abduction of Reverend Kim Dong Shik, who's a U.S. citizen, and his wife is an Illinois resident, children U.S. citizens. I'm going to enter this letter in the record. It's from the Illinois delegation. They have said they would not support any normalization with North Korea until his abduction is dealt with.

[The information referred to follows:]

EXHIBIT 5

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2009.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER R. HILL,
Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and
Pacific Affairs, Washington DC.

DEAR MR. HILL: I write in light of your nomination to serve in the critical position of U.S. ambassador to Iraq.

While I do not question your qualifications as a diplomat, I must be frank in telling you that I was often disappointed in your approach to diplomacy with North Korea—specifically your marginalization and often times seemingly utter neglect of human rights. In a Washington Post piece, Michael Gerson described your shaping of America's North Korea policy in this way, "Hill has been a tireless advocate of preemptive diplomatic concessions and the exclusion of human rights issues from reports and negotiations." It is difficult to know how much the policy you pursued simply reflected the president and the secretary's aims or whether you were in fact the chief architect and advocate of this approach. Regardless, while Iraq and North Korea are obviously two very different countries, it gives me pause as I consider the human rights challenges confronting Iraq's ethno-religious minorities who are increasingly under siege.

More than 500,000 Christians, or roughly 50 percent, have fled Iraq since 2003. Even though Christians make up only 3 percent of the country's population, according to the UN High Commission for Refugees, they comprise nearly half of all refugees leaving Iraq. As Iraq has continued to stabilize, these minority populations, including the ancient Christian community—some of whom still speak Aramaic, the language of Jesus—is dwindling and increasingly vulnerable to marginalization and targeted attacks, of the sort we witnessed in Mosul this past fall.

I have already requested that Secretary Clinton facilitate the development of a comprehensive policy to address the plight of these struggling minority communities, and, consistent with the recommendations of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, that she appoint a special envoy for human rights in Iraq to our Embassy in Baghdad, reporting directly to her.

Similarly, should you be confirmed, I urge that these communities, which are foundational to a modern pluralistic Iraq, not be neglected on your watch. Before departing for Baghdad, it is critical that you meet with a coalition of NGOs, consisting in part of members of the Iraqi diaspora, so that they might brief you on the unique challenges confronting these ancient faith communities and make additional concrete policy recommendations for their protection.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

EXHIBIT 6

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELA-
TIONS,

Washington, DC, January 28, 2005.

His Excellency PAK GIL YON,
Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the
Democratic People's Republic of Korea to
the United Nations, New York, NY.

DEAR AMBASSADOR PAK: This letter is to inform you and your government of the distress with which the undersigned Members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation received the finding from the Seoul Central District Prosecutor's Office on December 14, 2004 that South Korean citizen and U.S. permanent resident Reverend Kim Dong-Shik had been abducted by agents of your government in northeast China in January 2000 and taken forcibly into North Korea. Your government, regrettably, has, by its own admission, been involved in the abductions of a number of Japanese citizens, as well as an even greater number of South Korean citizens.

Reverend Kim Dong-Shik, as you may be aware, is the spouse of Mrs. Young Hwa Kim of Chicago, Illinois, and is the parent of U.S. citizens, one of whom is currently residing in Skokie, Illinois. Citizens from a Korean-American church in the Chicago area have also raised this matter as an issue of grave concern and have requested Congressional assistance in ascertaining the facts behind the disappearance and current whereabouts of Reverend Kim. In pursuit of these issues, Mrs. Kim and a delegation from Illinois will be visiting Capitol Hill in the near future.

The successful resolution of this case, therefore, is of critical importance to us, both because of the constituent interests involved as well as because it is a case involving the most fundamental of human rights. Reverend Kim, in his selfless efforts to assist refugees escaping in an underground network to third countries, brings to mind two great heroes held in high esteem in the United States. The first is Ms. Harriet Tubman, who established an underground railroad allowing for the escape from slavery of those held in bondage before President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation; the second is the Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg who, during the dark days of the world conflict against fascism in the Second World War, rescued Jewish refugees trapped in Hungary. We view Reverend Kim Dong-Shik as also being a hero who assisted with the escape of the powerless and forgotten.

We, therefore, wish to inform the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) that we will NOT support the removal of your government from the State Department list of State Sponsors of Terrorism until such time, among other reasons, as a full accounting is provided to the Kim family regarding the fate of the Reverend Kim Dong-Shik following his abduction into North Korea five years ago.

Sincerely,

J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Henry J. Hyde, Chairman; Richard J. Durbin, U.S. Senator; Barack Obama, U.S. Senator; Lane Evans, Member of Congress; Jerry F. Costello, Member of Congress; Luis V. Gutierrez, Member of Congress; Donald A. Manzullo, Member of Congress; Bobby L. Rush, Member of Congress; Jesse L. Jackson, Member of Congress. Ray LaHood, Member of Congress; Jerry Weller, Member of Congress; Danny Davis, Member of Congress; John Shimkus, Member of Congress; Judy Biggert, Member of Congress; Jan D. Schakowsky, Member of Congress; Timothy Johnson, Member of Congress;

Rahm Emanuel, Member of Congress; Melissa L. Bean, Member of Congress; Daniel Lipinski, Member of Congress.

EXHIBIT 7

STUDY BACKS BOSNIAN SERB'S CLAIM OF
IMMUNITY

(By Marlise Simons)

PARIS—Every time Radovan Karadzic, the onetime Bosnian Serb leader, appears in court on war crimes charges, he has hammered on one recurring claim: a senior American official pledged that he would never be standing there.

The official, Richard C. Holbrooke, now a special envoy on Afghanistan and Pakistan for the Obama administration, has repeatedly denied promising Mr. Karadzic immunity from prosecution in exchange for abandoning power after the Bosnian war.

But the rumor persists, and different versions have recently emerged that line up with Mr. Karadzic's assertion, including a new historical study of the Yugoslav wars published by Purdue University in Indiana.

Charles W. Ingrao, the study's co-editor, said that three senior State Department officials, one of them retired, and several other people with knowledge of Mr. Holbrooke's activities told him that Mr. Holbrooke assured Mr. Karadzic in July 1996 that he would not be pursued by the international war crimes tribunal in The Hague if he left politics.

Mr. Karadzic had already been charged by the tribunal with genocide and other crimes against civilians.

Two of the sources cited anonymously in the new study, a former senior State Department official who spent almost a decade in the Balkans and another American who was involved with international peacekeeping there in the 1990s, provided additional details in interviews with The New York Times, speaking on condition that they not be further identified.

The former State Department official said he was told of the offer by people who were close to Mr. Holbrooke's team at the time. The other source said that Mr. Holbrooke personally and emphatically told him about the deal on two occasions.

While the two men agreed, as one of them put it, that "Holbrooke did the right thing and got the job done," the recurring story of the deal has dogged Mr. Holbrooke.

Last summer, after more than a decade on the run, Mr. Karadzic was found living disguised in Belgrade, Serbia's capital. He was arrested and sent to the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia in The Hague for his trial, which is expected to start this year.

Asked for comment for this article, Mr. Holbrooke repeated his denial in a written statement. "No one in the U.S. government ever promised anything, nor made a deal of any sort with Karadzic," he said, noting that Mr. Karadzic stepped down in the summer of 1996 under intense American pressure.

"The agreement almost came to grief when Holbrooke vigorously refused Karadzic's demand, and Hill's appeal, that he affix his signature to it," the study says, citing unidentified State Department sources.

The study, the product of eight years of research by historians, jurists and social scientists from all sides of the conflict, was an effort to reconcile disparate views of the wars that tore the former Yugoslavia apart in the 1990s, Mr. Ingrao said.

Neither Mr. Hill nor Mr. Goldberg responded to requests for interviews for this article.

In an interview, the former State Department official, who had access to confidential reports and to members of the Holbrooke team, said that during that evening in 1996,

Mr. Milosevic and other Serbian officials were on the phone with Mr. Karadzic, who was in Pale, Bosnia.

The former official said that Mr. Karadzic wanted written assurances that he would not be pursued for war crimes and refused to sign without them.

"Holbrooke told the Serbs, 'You can give him my word he won't be pursued,' but Holbrooke refused to sign anything," the official said. Mr. Holbrooke could make that promise because he knew that American and other Western militaries in Bosnia were not then making arrests, the official said.

There were some 60,000 American and NATO troops in Bosnia, but the soldiers had no orders to arrest indicted Bosnians, for fear of inciting local rebellion.

In the brief statement Mr. Karadzic eventually signed, he agreed to withdraw "from all political activities" and to step down from office. It carried the signatures of Mr. Milosevic and four other Serbian leaders acting as witnesses and guarantors. It did not include any Americans' names and made no mention of immunity.

The American who was involved in peace-keeping insisted in an interview that Mr. Holbrooke himself told him that he had made a deal with Mr. Karadzic to get him to leave politics. He recalled meeting Mr. Holbrooke in Sarajevo, Bosnia, on the eve of Bosnian elections in November 2000, just after Mr. Milosevic had finally been ousted from power in Serbia.

Mr. Holbrooke was worried about the outcome of the Bosnian vote because he knew that Mr. Karadzic was still secretly running his nationalist political party and picking candidates, including mayors and police chiefs who had run prison camps and organized massacres.

"Holbrooke was angry; he was ranting," the American recalled. He quoted Mr. Holbrooke as saying: "That son of a bitch Karadzic. I made a deal with him that if he'd pull out of politics, we wouldn't go after him. He's broken that deal and now we're going to get him."

Mr. Karadzic's party won those elections in the Bosnian Serb republic. Shortly afterward, he disappeared from public view.

"In subsequent meetings, as a private citizen, I repeatedly urged officials in both the Clinton and Bush administrations to capture Karadzic," Mr. Holbrooke said. "I am glad he has finally been brought to justice, even though he uses his public platform to disseminate these fabrications."

Mr. Holbrooke declined to accept further questions and did not address the specifics of the new accounts.

Mr. Karadzic, by insisting that he is exempt from legal proceedings, has now forced the war crimes tribunal to deal with his allegations, illustrating the difficulty of both administering international justice and conducting diplomacy.

In December, tribunal judges ruled that even if a deal had been made, it would have no bearing on a trial. They said no immunity agreement would be valid before an international tribunal in a case of genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity. Mr. Karadzic is charged with all three.

But Mr. Karadzic has appealed and filed motions demanding that prosecutors disclose every scrap of confidential evidence about negotiations with Mr. Holbrooke. He has asked his lawyers to seek meetings with American diplomats.

His demands have led the court to write to the United States government for clarification.

Peter Robinson, a lawyer for Mr. Karadzic, said that he had received a promise from Washington that he could interview Philip S. Goldberg, who was on the Holbrooke team

meeting in Belgrade the night the resignation was negotiated.

"Goldberg took the notes at that meeting," Mr. Robinson said. "The U.S. government has agreed to search for the notes and provide them if they find them."

A State Department spokesman said that the government was cooperating with the tribunal, but would provide no further details.

Mr. Holbrooke, who brokered the peace agreement that ended the Bosnian war in 1995, returned to Belgrade in 1996 to press Mr. Karadzic to resign as president of the Bosnian Serb republic. Mr. Holbrooke's memoirs recount a night of fierce negotiation on July 18, 1996, but make no mention of any pledge of immunity.

The Purdue University study, "Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies: A Scholars' Initiative," says that Mr. Holbrooke "instructed his principal assistant, Christopher Hill, to draft the memorandum to be signed by Karadzic," committing him to give up power.

Mr. Ingrao said Mr. Holbrooke used Slobodan Milosevic, then the Serbian leader, and other Serbian officials as intermediaries to convey the promise of immunity and to reach the deal with Mr. Karadzic.

EXHIBIT 8

[From washingtonpost.com, Feb. 4, 2004]

AUSCHWITZ UNDER OUR NOSES

(By Anne Applebaum)

Nearly 60 years ago last week, Auschwitz was liberated. On Jan. 27, 1945, four Russian soldiers rode into the camp. They seemed "wonderfully concrete and real," remembered Primo Levi, one of the prisoners, "perched on their enormous horses, between the gray of the snow and the gray of the sky." But they did not smile, nor did they greet the starving men and women. Levi thought he knew why: They felt "the shame that a just man experiences at another man's crime, the feeling of guilt that such a crime should exist."

Nowadays, it seems impossible to understand why so few people, at the time of the Auschwitz liberation, even knew that the camp existed. It seems even harder to explain why those who did know did nothing. In recent years a plethora of respectable institutions—the Vatican, the U.S. government, the international Jewish community, the Allied commanders—have all been accused of "allowing" the Holocaust to occur, through ignorance or ill will or fear, or simply because there were other priorities, such as fighting the war.

We shake our heads self-righteously, certain that if we'd been there, liberation would have come earlier—all the while failing to see that the present is no different. Quite a lot has changed in 60 years, but the ways in which information about crimes against humanity can simultaneously be "known" and not known hasn't changed at all. Nor have other interests and other priorities ceased to distract people from the feelings of shame and guilt they would certainly feel, if only they focused on them.

Look, for example, at the international reaction to a documentary, aired last Sunday night on the BBC. It described atrocities committed in the concentration camps of contemporary North Korea, where, it was alleged, chemical weapons are tested on prisoners. Central to the film was the testimony of Kwon Hyuk, a former administrator at a North Korean camp. "I witnessed a whole family being tested on suffocating gas and dying in the gas chamber," he said. "The parents, son and a daughter. The parents were vomiting and dying, but till the very last moment they tried to save the kids by

doing mouth-to-mouth breathing." The documentary also included testimony from a former prisoner, who says she saw 50 women die after being deliberately fed poison. And it included documents smuggled out of the country that seemed to sentence a prisoner to a camp "for the purpose of human experimentation."

But the documentary was only a piece of journalism. Do we really know that it is true? We don't. It was aired on the BBC, after all, an organization whose journalistic standards have recently been questioned. It was based on witness testimony, which is notoriously unreliable. All kinds of people might have had an interest in making the film more sensational, including journalists (good for their careers) or North Korean defectors (good for their cause).

The veracity of the information has been further undermined by the absence of official confirmation. The South Korean government, which believes that appeasement of the North will lead to reunification, has already voiced skepticism about the claims: "We will need to investigate," a spokesman said. The U.S. government has other business on the Korean Peninsula too. On Monday Secretary of State Colin L. Powell told a group of Post journalists that he feels optimistic about the prospect of a new round of nuclear talks between North Korea and its neighbors. He didn't mention the gas chambers, even whether he's heard about them.

In the days since the documentary aired, few other news organizations have picked up the story either. There are other priorities: the president's budget, ricin in the Senate office building, David Kay's testimony, a murder of a high school student, Super Tuesday, Janet Jackson. With the possible exception of the last, these are all genuinely important subjects. They are issues people care deeply about. North Korea is far away and, quite frankly, it doesn't seem there's a lot we can do about it.

Later—in 10 years, or in 60—it will surely turn out that quite a lot was known in 2004 about the camps of North Korea. It will turn out that information collected by various human rights groups, South Korean churches, oddball journalists and spies added up to a damning and largely accurate picture of an evil regime. It will also turn out that there were things that could have been done, approaches the South Korean government might have made, diplomatic channels the U.S. government might have opened, pressure the Chinese might have applied.

Historians in Asia, Europe and here will finger various institutions, just as we do now, and demand they justify their past actions. And no one will be able to understand how it was possible that we knew of the existence of the gas chambers but failed to act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kansas for making such a powerful, persuasive case for human rights and freedom in North Korea and around the world. I wish to change subjects slightly for a few minutes and talk about some experiences over the last couple of weeks.

STOP THE SPENDING

Last Wednesday, tens of thousands of Americans celebrated tax day by speaking out against the direction of this Federal Government. I attended three tea parties in South Carolina. What struck me the most was how non-partisan these events were. These were families, couples with children, not

necessarily Republicans or Democrats, but both were there. They did not care about parties or candidates. They cared about their kids and the debt we are saddling them with, with almost everything we do in Washington. They cited with their signs and their voices that every American today has a \$35,000 share in our national debt. That is just today, not counting what we have added. And it does not count the unfunded costs of Social Security and Medicare that we borrowed from our future.

The way we are spending up here, the per capita debt in our country will soon exceed the per capita income. We are not just bankrupting our country, we are bankrupting generations of Americans not even born yet.

This is a moral issue. Every dollar spent represents another freedom seized, another constitutional principle ignored, another opportunity squandered. The American people are tired of politicians—Republicans and Democrats—borrowing and spending money on programs we do not need, programs they know will not work.

The message of the tea parties is clear: Stop growing Government and spending all our money, all our kids' money, all our grandkids' money.

But will we get the message? We keep hearing that we are in the middle of an economic crisis, but we are in the middle of a political crisis. We hear a lot about corporate greed, but that pales in comparison to the political greed of elected officials who continue to make promises that we cannot pay for and borrowing the money to do it.

A poll conducted last week suggests that while a majority of American people have a favorable view of these tea parties, only 13 percent of the political class does. It is the same pattern over and over again on the stimulus, on earmarks, on socialized and rationed health care, on the proposed tax on electricity and energy. Americans disagree with Washington on these socialistic experiments, and our leaders act as if it is the American people who are the ones who are out of touch.

Indeed, no sooner had the protesters gone home than they learned that their preference for freedom, limited Government, and local control marked them as potential terrorist threats, according to a report by the Department of Homeland Security.

Americans have been misled and lied to by elected officials who promise the world while stealing our future. And they have had enough. Tea parties are only the beginning. Americans have come to understand that many of our problems are caused by more Government and that they can only be solved by more freedom.

Think of the things that are categorized as crises today—a crisis in education, a crisis in health care, a crisis in energy, our transportation infrastructure, banking and finance, the auto industry. But who has been running these services for the last several

decades? Who has been running our education system? It has not been the free market. It has not been the free people. It has been Government, with the price we are paying expanding faster than any other service. We spend more per capita than any other country in the world, yet consistently we lose ground to other industrialized nations. We do not need more Federal control, we need more freedom in education, more choices, more competition, more technology, the kinds of things that Government and union control cannot provide in our education. It may be a crisis, but it is not one caused by freedom, it is one caused by politicians.

What about health care? We talk about the number of uninsured Americans, but have we given freedom a chance? The rules and laws we pass here make it virtually impossible for individuals to own and keep their own insurance policy. There are ways we can solve this problem, there are ways we can get every American insured without spending one additional dime of tax dollars. But instead, the movement in Washington is toward Government health care, socialized medicine, and we have made a downpayment in our recent budget in that direction.

We have an energy crisis, but who has held back this country from exploring and developing our own energy reserves? It has not been the free markets or the free people; it has been this Government. And under the name of environmental protection, we have actually made the environment worse by blocking nuclear energy, blocking natural gas development, and not moving where other countries have toward cleaner energy sources that are within our reach.

What about our transportation infrastructure? Who has been running that? Increasingly, the Federal Government takes more and more gas tax dollars and instead of giving them back to States for their priorities, we earmark it in every different direction. The last Secretary of Transportation basically said we cannot have a transportation program because it is all politically directed. That is political greed. That is not a fault of freedom.

What about banking and finance? The Government was going to help our financial system, so they made loans, not just to those too big to fail. If you talk to local bankers, the Federal Government essentially forced these banks to take this money, and now they will not let them give it back. And they are now talking about converting these loans into common stock so the Federal Government owns the banks. That is not freedom. That is not the America we know. That is nationalization, that is socialization of a country.

Freedom has not failed in the financial markets. It has been this Government, our oversight, and the Government intermediaries of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that essentially packaged and brokered all of these so-called toxic assets.

Freedom has not failed. Has freedom failed in our auto industry? Of course not. The Government and the labor unions have been running the American auto companies for years. Management has very little discretion. If you look at other auto companies that are free of Government control, free of the barnacles of unionization, we see these companies succeeding in the United States. You cannot bail them out with more money; you have to bail them out with freedom.

Over the work period, I had a chance to visit Europe and the Middle East. I had a chance to welcome the new Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, back to office. It was interesting to hear him talk. He is concerned about the direction of our country moving toward a more socialist direction, while he realized the opportunities in Israel were to move away from socialization to more free markets, more land reform that allowed more property ownership, exactly the opposite of where we see us going. He realized that in order to have a prosperous Israel and a strong military and a bright future, he needed to move his country more toward freedom.

I heard the same thing in Brussels from a lot of our European allies, startled at the level of spending and debt the United States has taken on, concerned that we have the ability to pay it back, concerned that our commitment to the military is falling off, concerned that America will not be there as promised as part of a NATO partner sometime in the future.

But it was concern about our abandonment of free market principles, free trade, the things that can make the world safe and prosperous, that the United States seemed to be pulling back from those principles.

I just wanted to share a few thoughts today because as we talk about more Government and more spending in almost every area of our lives, and we continue to blame our problems on freedom and capitalism—the people who work hard and take personal responsibility—it seems we have it backwards from what actually made America great and exceptional and unique and prosperous and good.

I keep hearing our economic problems were caused by the free market. But what free market? What have I talked about that has had a chance to work as a free market? If you look at those areas where the Government has not yet reached its tentacles in to regulate to the point of paralysis, look at our telecommunication system, which we are talking about in committee as to how we can regulate it. The incredible explosion of innovation and choice and competition—the cell phones, the BlackBerrys, the fantastic ways we have to communicate all over the world—could never have been created by a government system. It was created by free people and free markets, and that can work in every area, as it has before in America.

Let's not blame this financial crisis and the housing problems on freedom and free markets. The Government itself, through its public-private partnership of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, was the broker of these deals—the middle man of toxic assets. No private company would take the kind of risks that were taken unless they could first get cheap money, which the Federal Reserve provided, and then have a basic government guarantee for these loans that they were making and packaging. The Government is in the middle of this crisis. It is political greed. It is not the fault of freedom.

This Congress and this Federal Government are really at a crossroads, and the American people are standing there with these tea parties telling us: Don't give up on freedom. Government does not work. Socialism does not work. There is no example in history where it has. Yet we contemplate every day another step closer to more Government control. I am thankful the American people are standing up. They are alarmed at what we are doing. It has nothing to do with politics. It has nothing to do with a political party. It has everything to do with what makes this country great and good. But we have abandoned it in Congress, and this crossroads at which we stand is the crossroads between freedom and socialism.

Some folks say you shouldn't use that term, "socialism." But, folks, when the Government basically controls or owns most aspects of economic production, which is where we are headed today, we are talking about socialism, and socialism that is to the left of where many European countries are. We can stop it, but we have to stop it starting today, and that is why these tea parties are so important. I hope they will shake up a few people here in both parties. I hope they will send a message that this Government is for the people, and of the people, and by the people. If we don't get it right, if we don't listen to them, these people can take it back, and I am thankful they are willing to stand up and express their voices. And I am very sorry anyone in this administration or this Government would categorize them as a threat in any way just because they are willing to speak out against what they know is wrong in Washington.

I encourage my colleagues, as we think about one spending program after another, one Government takeover after another, that we not give up on freedom and that we listen to the American people.

With that, Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I came to speak in support of the nomination of Christopher Hill to be the Ambassador to Iraq, but I have heard my distinguished colleague from South Carolina speak, and I feel compelled to say a few things in response.

It is easy to rail against the Government when you are part of it. It is easy to rail against the Government. But when we have a national disaster, whether it be September 11 or hurricanes or floods or tornadoes, it is only the National Government that can come and help our fellow citizens. It is only the National Government that can come at the end of the day and create a common defense. It is only the National Government that very often can stop us from economic collapse.

Now, I am for the free market as much as anyone else, but there is a difference between a free market and a free-for-all market. What we saw over the last 8 years is regulators, who were supposed to act as the cops on the beat, ultimately allowing the private sector, particularly those who are regulated industries, to regulate themselves. The consequence of that is we have excess that now each and every American is paying for. Yet there are those who want to rail against that.

There are those who also rail about spending. I am with them. But the time to have railed against that was in the last years that saw the debt and the deficit dramatically grow. If President Obama did absolutely nothing—nothing—he would have inherited a \$1.3 trillion deficit. So I think we need some intellectual honesty in this Chamber as we have our debates.

Mr. President, I want to now talk about the President's nomination of Christopher Hill to serve as our next Ambassador to Iraq. I support that. It should be clear to all of us that the position of the Ambassador to Iraq is one of the most critical ambassadorial selections that President Obama will make. We are at the beginning of a period of transition in our relationship with Iraq. We are now working under a Status of Forces Agreement. Our troops are winding down their combat role and many will withdraw by June 30 of this year.

In his speech to the Marine Corps at Camp Lejeune at the end of February, President Obama made his policy clear: by the 31st day of August of the year 2010, in accordance with the Status of Forces Agreement, the combat mission of U.S. troops in Iraq will come to an end. But even though the end of our combat mission in Iraq may now be in sight, we cannot forget that today we still have more than 140,000 U.S. troops there, and we have over 1,000 U.S. civilian employees from the Department of State, from USAID, and many other departments and agencies who have been assigned to work at the Embassy in Baghdad under the authority of our Chief of Mission.

We all look forward to the day when our combat mission in Iraq is ended, our troops are returned home, and the Iraqis enjoy relative peace and security under the full protection of their own security forces. But that day has not yet come. We are at the beginning, not the end, of the transition in our role in Iraq. It is a time of uncertainty and

risk, and that is why it is so urgent that the Ambassador's position be filled without delay.

We hear the military counterparts constantly saying—General Odierno—where is my civilian counterpart? Where is the Ambassador?

Now, I certainly respect the decision of any colleague to closely scrutinize any of the President's appointments. This is a keystone position at a critical juncture in our relationship with Iraq, and we need to ensure the person leading our Embassy in Baghdad is and has in full measure the background, skills, and pragmatism needed. I have scrutinized Ambassador Hill's qualifications and his testimony, both before the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, and in responding to questions for the record, and I am convinced that in nominating Ambassador Hill, President Obama has chosen exactly the right person to lead our Embassy in Baghdad at this point in time. I urge my colleagues to confirm his nomination without delay.

During his 32-year career in the Foreign Service, Ambassador Hill has developed a well-earned reputation as a diplomatic trouble-shooter by taking on a series of difficult assignments, including serving as an ambassador in the Balkans, Special Envoy to Kosovo, Ambassador to Poland and South Korea, and most recently as Special Envoy to the six-party talks involving North Korea's nuclear program. He was one of the State Department's top negotiators during the 1995 Dayton talks that ended the war in Bosnia. He has never balked from taking on the most difficult assignments and has a long list of honors and awards which stand as evidence of his accomplishments.

Now, one of the concerns raised by my colleague earlier was about Ambassador Hill's experience, or lack of experience, in the Middle East. It should be noted that our three prior ambassadors in Baghdad—Ryan Crocker, Zalmay Khalizad, and John Negroponte—the persons who know best the experience needed to do the job—do not share this concern. They have expressed their support for Ambassador Hill's confirmation.

I am confident the experience Ambassador Hill has gained in other areas can be readily applied to the challenges he will face in Iraq. Ambassador Hill's experience in coordinating the multi-lateral negotiations on North Korea's nuclear program will serve him well when he seeks the support of Iraq's neighbors on nuclear issues. That experience will also serve him well in working with Iraq's numerous political factions. Ambassador Hill's experience in the Balkans has prepared him to deal with sectarianism, border disputes, human rights, refugees, developmental assistance, and postconflict normalization of relations, all of which will be major issues in his portfolio in Baghdad.

Mr. President, I share the concerns expressed by my colleague about North

Korea's human rights record, and I agree completely with Ambassador Hill's own assessment of that record of North Korea when he said it is abysmal. But as others have noted, Ambassador Hill's mission with regard to North Korea was set by his superiors in the Bush administration, not by him. The primary objective was to push the North Koreans to end their nuclear weapons program and their nuclear proliferation activities. That was his mission, directed by the Bush administration. That is the mission he undertook to accomplish.

I appreciate Ambassador Hill's continued willingness to take on these tough assignments. He is the right person to lead our Embassy in Baghdad at this time, and I urge his nomination be confirmed without delay.

Finally, I too often hear on the other side of the aisle a very familiar refrain lately. It is no—no to just about everything we are trying to do here. President Obama was elected with overwhelming support to try to move this country in a different direction, and what we hear consistently on the other side of the aisle—using the procedural mechanisms of the filibuster in this institution—is no and no and no. Then, while they hold up nominees, such as yesterday's nominees for Assistant Attorneys General—incredibly important to the Attorney General for law and order in this country—when we finally get to the vote, we see overwhelming bipartisan votes.

We have delayed it an inordinate amount of time instead of having those people work for the security of the country, instead of being able to move this agenda forward, instead of having more time for the Senate to meet some of the Nation's critical challenges.

It is time to get over the noes and start saying yes to some of the critical issues we need. The first yes should be today, with Ambassador Hill. That will move our foreign policy agenda ahead in one of the most critical parts of the world today.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for a very precise and important set of arguments about why we ought to proceed forward, and I appreciate his taking time to come to the Senate floor to do that.

Momentarily, it is my hope we will be able to propound a unanimous consent agreement. We are just waiting, I hope, for the word to come back from Senator KYL shortly. I hope that can come very quickly so there could be a vote around 5:15 on this nomination.

Let me just say a couple of words about a few of the things that have been said. Obviously, we hope to be able to divide up the remaining time between us and then conclude the debate, but part of what the Senator from Kansas has said, both this morning and this afternoon, is that the

human rights envoy, then Jay Lefkowitz of the State Department, was not invited to take part in the six-party talks per an exchange that Senator BROWBACK had with Chris Hill—with Ambassador Hill—before the Armed Services Committee.

Ambassador Hill has addressed this issue, I have addressed this issue on a number of occasions, and we have really laid this out. The full text of his remarks has been submitted for the RECORD. In a nutshell, let me just state one last time for the record exactly what happened.

As Ambassador Hill made clear at the time, his promise to Senator BROWBACK applied to the future negotiating sessions, except those specifically dealing with nuclear disarmament where the Human Rights Assistant Secretary had no portfolio whatsoever. To make it clear, the Senator from Kansas somehow believes that no matter what, Special Envoy Lefkowitz should have been invited to that, but that was not a decision that was up to Ambassador Hill. Let's be clear about this. That was not Ambassador Hill's decision to make.

The New York Times on January of 2008 reported that the decision about who would attend the six-party talks and what issues would be discussed was made by Secretary Rice and the President. Here are the words of Secretary Rice speaking about Human Rights Envoy Jay Lefkowitz as quoted by the New York Times on January 23, 2008. "He," Lefkowitz, "doesn't work on the six-party talks." This is Secretary of State Rice talking, rebuking her own Assistant Secretary.

He doesn't work on the six-party talks. He doesn't know what's going on in the six-party talks and he certainly has no say in what American policy will be in the six-party talks.

That is exactly what Secretary Rice said. So the Senator may have a quarrel but it is not with Ambassador Hill. Secretary Rice was very explicit in that rebuke. Quoting Secretary Rice, again from the New York Times, this is what she said:

I know where the President stands, and I know where I stand, and those are the people who speak for American policy.

That is the level of the rebuke you are talking about here. It is almost unprecedented, frankly. And here the Senator is, trying to carry water for this rebuked Assistant Secretary who was inappropriately asserting himself at that time. But regardless of whether you think he should have been there or should not have been there, it was not Ambassador Hill's decision to make. He took daily instructions from the President and from the Secretary of State, from the State Department. That is what a good diplomat and negotiator at important talks like that does and that is exactly what he did.

I ask unanimous consent the full text of the article in the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 2008]
RICE REBUKES BUSH ENVOY WHO CRITICIZED
POLICY ON NORTH KOREA

(By Helene Cooper)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, in a rare public rebuke, has upbraided a White House envoy who criticized United States diplomacy toward North Korea that is aimed at coaxing the North Koreans to give up their nuclear weapons.

Ms. Rice said the official, Jay Lefkowitz, President Bush's special envoy on North Korean human rights, was not speaking for the administration when he told an audience at the American Enterprise Institute last week that the United States "should consider a new approach to North Korea" because the current approach was unlikely to resolve the issue before the end of Mr. Bush's term in a year.

Speaking to reporters aboard her flight to Berlin on Monday, Ms. Rice sharply disagreed, and said Mr. Lefkowitz should stick to human rights and leave the talks over the North's nuclear policy to her, Mr. Bush and the other nations involved: Russia, China, Japan and South Korea.

"He's the human rights envoy," Ms. Rice said. "That's what he knows. That's what he does. He doesn't work on the six-party talks. He doesn't know what's going on in the six-party talks and he certainly has no say in what American policy will be in the six-party talks."

Mr. Lefkowitz, reached at his office in New York, said he and Ms. Rice spoke on Friday about the disagreement, and he described their conversation as "very amicable, substantive and useful."

"I'm going to have a great deal more to say about elevating the issue of human rights in North Korea, which is clearly a priority for the president and Congress," he said.

The dispute comes at a time when nuclear talks have stalled, with North Korea missing a year-end deadline to disclose all of its nuclear programs. A debate within the administration has fractured along familiar lines, with hard-line national security hawks in Vice President Dick Cheney's office and at the White House arguing for a more confrontational approach with the North.

On the other side, Mr. Bush's lead North Korea nuclear negotiator, Christopher R. Hill, backed by Ms. Rice, has argued that the United States should continue a more restrained approach, one that was widely credited with bringing about an agreement last year intended to eventually lead to the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

Ms. Rice said that Mr. Bush had "spoken as to what our policy is in the six-party talks."

"I know where the president stands," she added, "and I know where I stand, and those are the people who speak for American policy."

Mr. KERRY. The second thing alleged here is somehow Ambassador Hill failed to implement the North Korean Human Rights Act. That is not accurate. Facts are facts. Facts, as has been said many times, are stubborn things. Consistent with the Human Rights Act, Ambassador Hill secured the admission of the first North Korean refugees into the United States in 2006. He worked to ensure the safe passage to South Korea of asylum seekers from the North who had been detained in other east Asian

countries. He backed increased funding of radio broadcasting by Radio Free Asia. During Ambassador Hill's tenure as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, the State Department approved the expenditure of \$2 million of our taxpayer funds to sponsor the Seoul Summit on North Korean Human Rights in South Korea, in December of 2005. Ambassador Hill met regularly with North Korean refugees and defectors who made it out of North Korea.

The record simply doesn't substantiate the notion that Chris Hill was inattentive to human rights. In the morning debate, the Senator from Kansas showed a dramatic picture of starving North Korean children. Noting that today is Holocaust Remembrance Day, Senator BROWNBACK said we should not be indifferent to the suffering of North Korean people and we must not consider human rights inside North Korea to be a low priority. We all agree with the Senator. Of course we should not allow it to be a low priority.

He noted that unnamed "U.S. diplomats" had opposed decisive action to bomb the rail lines leading to Auschwitz during World War II and said the current situation with north Korea is "eerily familiar."

All of us should listen carefully to what the Senator has said about North Korea and its oppression. None of us should forget the lessons of the Holocaust. We have an obligation to respond to great humanitarian crises, whether they are caused by nature or by man.

But to show a picture of starving North Korean children in the debate on Ambassador Hill's qualifications and to imply somehow that he is indifferent to their plight does a good public servant an enormous disservice—particularly one whose record is what I have described, who time and again has fought for the implementation of the Human Rights Act and who has taken personal risks on occasion to enforce human rights.

The date of the photograph that was there was not in fact declared, but I believe it was during the great Republic of North Korea's famine in 1996 and 1997. If that is true, that is 10 years before Ambassador Chris Hill began his duties as the lead envoy in the six-party talks. So, again, to create some sense of linkage or nexus here is inappropriate.

In any case, the bottom line is this. No one is going to deny that North Korea is a country on the brink of famine and failure. It is a failed place. None of us should be idle in the face of this basic threat to the health of the North Korean people and to the security of the peninsula and of the region. It is deplorable that North Korea has recently expelled food aid workers. I hope they are going to reverse that decision. We are going to listen carefully to testimony before our committee on May 6. We will have a comprehensive view on what is happening in North

Korea and what the possibilities are for our policy. But let me emphasize: Chris Hill never ignored that situation. He worked with skill and persistence to secure direct access for five U.S. NGOs, including Christian groups, to provide aid to millions of North Koreans, including hungry children exactly like the kids who were depicted in the photograph on the floor this morning.

Thanks to the work of Ambassador Hill, Korean-speaking U.S. aid workers in 2008–2009 were able to travel to remote parts of North Korea never before reached by U.S. aid workers. That is an extraordinary success for which Ambassador Hill ought to be congratulated. They were able to establish five field offices in rural areas where they had never been before. That is a success. They were able to conduct unannounced visits to schools, hospitals, and orphanages. That is an accountability we never had before. That is a success. They were able to provide 100,000 tons of food aid to help people feed literally millions of North Korean children. That is a success.

This was the first U.S. food aid to North Korea delivered by U.S. NGOs since the year 2000 and this was delivered in the most intrusive, comprehensive monitoring system ever permitted by North Korea. Ambassador Hill deserves praise for his efforts on this issue, not the criticism that was implied on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5:15 p.m. today all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Christopher Hill to be Ambassador to Iraq, that the time until then be equally divided and controlled between myself and Senator BROWNBACK or designees of each of us, and that the 10 minutes immediately prior to the vote be equally divided and controlled between myself and Senator BROWNBACK; further, that the time controlled by the Republicans, of that time, Senator KYL control 15 minutes, Senator MCCAIN control 20 minutes, and that upon confirmation, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, no further motions be in order, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair and thank my colleague.

I yield the floor, according to the unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I agreed to this unanimous consent request to try to move this somewhat forward. I do believe this has been a healthy debate. It has been a good thing for us to discuss what took place in North Korea. It has been a good thing for us to discuss human rights. Anytime we can do that I think it is a good thing for us to discuss that set-

ting, moving into Iraq and the human rights concerns there.

I do want to address a few things the Senator from Massachusetts raised. One is on the North Korean Human Rights Act. I was the author of that bill. I know that bill. I worked to get that bill through. I pushed hard to get it through. One of the provisions in that bill was \$20 million authorized under the North Korean Human Rights Act for use of the North Korean Human Rights Act and to resettle refugees from North Korea in the United States and for a number of other issues. The administration has not requested a single dime under that authorization. It didn't ask for a single appropriation. So the idea that we have implemented the North Korean Human Rights Act when no money was requested underneath that, I guess I am impressed that could take place. I hope the Government can do that well in many other areas, where they do not ask for any money and then they fully comply with an act.

I do not think the act was fully complied with. I stated that specifically here on the RECORD, the places I do not believe it was complied with.

We are digging up right now how many people have been resettled in the United States under this North Korea Human Rights Act. It is a very small number—in the dozens at most. There is a lot of hesitation, hiccups taking place. The State Department is not pushing or working with this. A number of these refugees could have been resettled here by communities in the United States. This is actually one piece that could have been done very cheaply because the Korean-American community here would have resettled them, in many cases, without cost to the Federal Government. Very few were received or brought to the United States.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is a very distinguished Senator from Massachusetts with a lot of foreign policy experience. I admire all of that. I don't think he has worked quite as much on the Korean issue, certainly not as much as some other Members of this body and myself have worked on it. To say that this was a successful negotiation I think does not stand the overall, just view of this from the public's view, let alone from a diplomatic viewpoint.

When you look at this—you say it was a successful negotiation Ambassador Hill conducted with North Korea and the six-party talks. When you look at what North Korea has done since then and try to call it that, I don't think the Japanese would call this a successful negotiation that a missile was fired over their country, one that could reach the western United States. I don't think the Japanese would call it a successful negotiation that the abductees that were taken from Japan by the North Korean leadership and never accounted for were not accounted for during the negotiation.

This was the top issue. I had the Japanese Embassy contacting my office, complaining about the six-party talks and not being included on their top issues.

Why are they having to go through me? Because they can't go through Chris Hill. What kind of diplomat is that, when he has trouble with one of your main allies on a very specific item and issue that you can at least keep them tuned in and coming along with the overall issue?

China is one of the members of the six-party talks and China has been one of the lead problems with us dealing with North Korea. Yet we do not even push the Chinese on North Korea or North Korean human rights. We don't demand that the U.N. Human Rights Commission, or Commission on Human Rights, be allowed into China to determine are these North Korean refugees who are coming into China, are they economic migrants, are they refugees? We don't even push the Chinese to allow the U.N. in to look and see what the status is here. We do not push them at the six-party talks or the U.N. There is a complete failure of this.

I have had some refugees, a few who made it out of North Korea into the United States, a few more who made it into China—it is hard to get out of China and into the country—I have had a couple into my office, interviewing them, and they talked about the horrible conditions in China for North Korean refugees. Several hundred thousand, probably, are there, stateless, not protected. The women are generally captured and sold as concubines in China—captured like wild animals. This is their fate. We do not push the U.N. Human Rights Commission, don't push the Chinese to allow these individuals in, even though the Chinese have signed the declaration on this. We don't get that done. That is not a success taking place.

North Koreans recently abducted two Americans on the North Korea-China border. That has taken place. We don't object to that. They are developing part of the Syrian nuclear reactor. We don't get any information on that. We get incomplete information. We waive the terrorism list. We get nothing out of this deal. That is called a successful negotiation. I wonder what we will call successful negotiations in Iraq, then, if that is what we are calling a successful negotiation with the North Koreans in the six-party talks. I wonder what we will call successful human rights being determined in Iraq when we see the human rights record of what is taking place in North Korea. I wonder how that is going to be viewed.

For all of those reasons, I think this has been a healthy debate for us to have had. I hope when the supplemental comes up, we as a body do not waive again the Glenn sanctions on North Korea. That will come up in front of this body. It is an annual waiver that will have to take place. I hope we as a body do not fund North Korea beyond humanitarian assistance. That will come up in the supplemental. I

want to lay those markers down for my colleagues. I hope people are watching for this, that we do not reward the North Koreans, that we do not become their supporter like the Soviets were, and we do not continue this practice, much of which Chris Hill negotiated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAUFMAN). The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I would like to add my voice in support of the nominee, Chris Hill, whom I have had the pleasure of working with extensively in his current assignment, both in my role as a member of the Armed Services Committee and also of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I think he is a uniquely qualified individual. He has a long history of success. If anything, in the current debate, I believe he is perhaps being victimized by the fact that he is a loyal diplomat and was carrying out, with great expertise, the charges that had been given to him as someone who has a career in that area.

The numbers are pretty clear. He is going to get at least 70 votes. I believe it is time for us to end this debate and have the vote and get Chris Hill on his way. I respect the Senator from Kansas. I respect his concerns. He has been a great champion in terms of human rights. I would just suggest that this is not the place to continue this sort of discussion when the situation in Iraq is filled with unknowns, as it is, and our need of getting someone who has these types of qualifications over there to do this job.

The Chris Hill nomination is no more place to have this debate than it was when the nomination of the current Ambassador to South Korea was also held up for similar reasons. The points have been made. I think all of us understand them, and we need to get on with this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the confirmation of Assistant Secretary Christopher Hill as U.S. Ambassador to Iraq. I do not often come to the floor and object to nominees of the President of the United States. I believe elections have consequences, and that gives a President of the United States the benefit of the doubt and, even more, as far as the selection of the team he assembles in order to do the best job possible. So it is on a rare occasion that I object to a nominee of the President. But for too long and too deeply the United States of America has been involved in Iraq. There is a fragile situation there. We have recently seen an uptick in violence and attacks by extremist elements within Iraq. Now is not the time to send a person who I believe is not only unqualified on the face of it but also, in my view, has not conducted himself in the most admirable fashion in his previous work.

Today, we find ourselves in a situation few could have foreseen just a few

years ago. In late 2006, the situation in Iraq was deteriorating at an alarming rate. The Government was mired in internal strife and deadlock, sectarian violence crippled the lives of everyday Iraqis, and the outlook for the country's future was increasingly bleak. Yet in the face of seemingly unsurmountable challenges, a drastic change in strategy was introduced. GEN David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker launched and executed a civil-military counterinsurgency plan for Iraq that turned the tide of violence in a timeframe and to a degree that surprised even the optimists. The result has been a decrease in violence to the lowest levels since 2003 and real hope about the future of the country in which we have expended so much precious American blood and treasure. Yet as our commanders have repeatedly warned, these gains, though real, are fragile. The recent uptick in violence demonstrates anew that there remain elements within Iraq who wish to continue the violence and use their power to disrupt the transition to a more stable, democratic, and tolerant society. There also remain a number of difficult political and economic issues that lay ahead, including the distribution of oil revenues, the resettlement of refugees and internally displaced Iraqis, and ongoing tensions between Arabs and Kurds.

Ambassador Ryan Crocker was able to tackle these and other issues with great skill and expertise, ensuring unprecedented cooperation between the military, the Embassy, and their counterparts in the Iraqi Government. Ambassador Crocker's remarkable tenure was a byproduct of his lengthy career in the Middle East, not simply incidental to his long record of experience in the region. He had served two tours in Baghdad previously, including in the Coalition Provisional Authority, and he also served as Ambassador to several neighboring countries, including Lebanon, Kuwait, and Syria. His longstanding relationships with the region's leaders, his deep understanding of the complexities of Arab and Iraqi culture, and his ability to speak fluent Arabic were instrumental to his success.

Now, as we reduce the number of combat forces in Iraq, our national interests there will depend to an increasing degree on the skill of our diplomacy. I believe Ambassador Crocker's successor should possess many of the same traits he demonstrated, including experience in the region, an understanding of its players and dynamics, and relevant language skills. While Ambassador Hill has developed regional expertise, it is not in the Middle East. He has served as Ambassador in Europe and Asia, and speaks, admirably, three European languages but does not speak Arabic. He has not had the opportunity to work with leaders in Iraq or in the region. In fact, he has

never been to Iraq. He has limited experience at best in working with the military in the areas of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency.

The next U.S. Ambassador to Iraq will take over at a critical time in history of our involvement there. The U.S. Embassy in Baghdad is the world's largest and, along with our Embassy in Kabul, one of the two most important. The next Ambassador will play a vital role in consolidating our hard-won gains and ensuring that the country does not backslide into violence and turmoil. Given the enormity of our stakes in Iraq, I do not believe it is appropriate to select as our next Ambassador someone who will require on-the-job training in Iraqi affairs and in Middle East issues.

This may well be, I am afraid, the case with Mr. Hill.

There are a number of well-qualified individuals both within the Foreign Service and without it who would make excellent U.S. Ambassadors to Iraq. I do not believe Mr. Hill is among this number.

Our next Ambassador must hit the ground running and quickly work with the ground commander, Iraqi leaders, and others to confront the still great challenges that will present themselves over the next several years. We have made many mistakes in Iraq over a number of years, and they have cost us dearly. We have seen individuals take charge of U.S. efforts there without the background and experience necessary to succeed. I do not want us to repeat this mistake.

In addition to my concerns about Ambassador Hill's lack of Middle East experience, I also have questions arising from his tenure as U.S. Envoy to the six-party talks on North Korea's nuclear program. His legacy in those talks was controversial, as evidenced by complaints that other members of the interagency process were cut out of crucial policy deliberations. In a cable reported in the *Washington Post*, Thomas Schieffer, then-U.S. Ambassador to Japan, warned of irreparable harm to our relations with Tokyo resulting from an agreement that did not adequately address Japanese interests, including the issue of abductions. Ambassador Schieffer added that he could not play a role in remedying this state of affairs because Ambassador Hill had cut him out of the flow of information on North Korea.

Members of the Senate, including my colleague from Kansas, have asserted that Ambassador Hill broke a commitment made before a congressional committee to include North Korean Special Envoy for Human Rights Jay Lefkowitz to all future negotiating sessions with North Korea. I am aware that Ambassador Hill has asserted that he did not, in fact, break such a commitment, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Lefkowitz was not included in these subsequent negotiating sessions.

Given the key role the Congress and non-State Department agencies play in

our Iraq policy, however, I believe it is crucial that the next Ambassador to Iraq begin with a surplus of trust and good will with both. Ambassador Hill, I am afraid, starts with a deficit.

Ambassador Hill testified on October 25, 2007, before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee that "clearly we cannot be reaching a nuclear agreement with North Korea if at the same time they are proliferating. It is not acceptable." Yet, just months later, Ambassador Hill reached an agreement with Pyongyang despite its alleged nuclear proliferation to Syria, and reports have emerged of Iranian-North Korean cooperation in missile technology.

In recent weeks alone, North Korea has tested a ballistic missile in violation of United Nations Security Council resolutions, expelled inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency, removed seals on equipment, and turned off surveillance cameras at the Yongbyon nuclear plant and announced that it is withdrawing from the six-party talks.

While Mr. Hill did not bear sole responsibility for the content of U.S. policy toward North Korea, nor for the outcomes I have just described, it is nevertheless inescapable that he has played the key U.S. role in the formulation of policy toward Pyongyang for the past several years. To the eyes of most objective observers, those policies have failed.

Finally, I am troubled at comments and characterizations that appeared in a recent book by *New York Times* reporter David Sanger. In a statement to associates, for example, Ambassador Hill is quoted—and it is a direct quote—as saying of members of the administration—the administration which he supposedly served—"these [expletive] don't know how to negotiate. Everything is Appomattox. It's just 'Come out with your hands up.' It's not even really Appomattox, because at the end of Appomattox they let the Confederates keep their horses." This is perhaps the most colorful but not the only reference along these lines. Mr. Sanger quotes Ambassador Hill as saying that his instructions "showed a complete lack of understanding about how the world works," and the book, along with other accounts, cites numerous examples of Mr. Hill going beyond his instructions as authorized by the Department of State.

I know loyalty is a rare commodity in this town, and I do not expect a lot of it. I have seen a lot of situations where people seek to burnish their own images and their own reputations. I guess in some ways this is kind of a classic example, this quote of Ambassador Hill's, talking about the people he works for: "These [expletive] don't know how to negotiate." And he says—and it is a direct quote again—that his instructions "showed a complete lack of understanding about how the world works." I wonder if Mr. Hill really felt

this strongly, as these quotes indicate in Mr. Sanger's book, that he might have felt motivated for the good of the country to speak out publicly to remonstrate that "These [expletive] don't know how to negotiate." Instead, many times we see people more interested in how a *New York Times* reporter describes them than they are in serving the people who appoint them to the positions of responsibility.

In response to a lengthy set of questions I submitted to Ambassador Hill, he wrote that fulfilling the oath taken by a Foreign Service officer "means respecting the chain of command and remaining loyal to my leadership." In this, I agree with Mr. Hill. Mr. Hill, if those quotes are accurate—and I have no reason to believe they are not—obviously did not feel so at the time.

But, most importantly, the stakes in Iraq today could hardly be higher. We have been at this war for 6 long and difficult years. We made many mistakes. We paid an enormous price for the gains we see in that country today. And I must say, in all candor, we have seen another Ambassador to Iraq who went there without experience, and things did not turn out so well.

There are qualified individuals who are serving this Nation in and out of the Foreign Service.

It well known that Marine General Zinni was offered the job, at least by some members of the administration, and then somehow that offer disappeared. The fact is, we have sacrificed a lot. We owe it to the brave men and women who have sacrificed so much to ensure that the remarkable progress they have achieved translates into long-term stability as our combat troops begin leaving the country. After meeting with Ambassador Hill and examining his record, the concerns I raised following his nomination last month remain. For this reason, I must oppose his nomination as the next U.S. Ambassador to Iraq.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. 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. KYL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Ambassador Christopher Hill's nomination to serve as the next U.S. Ambassador to Iraq. As Senator BROWBACK and I stated in a letter to Secretary of State Clinton regarding Ambassador Hill's nomination:

Our role as United States Senators is not to choose the President's envoys. However, in the exercise of the Senate's constitutionally mandated role of advising and consenting to nominations, we are required to judge the qualifications by ambassadorial candidates on several levels, not least their past record of dealing with our own branch of government.

I do not believe Ambassador Hill has the requisite experience to be our Ambassador to Iraq at this critical time in that young democracy's history. Beyond that, serious allegations have been made by members of the press as well as Members of this body that call into question Mr. Hill's ability to follow orders and his willingness to be forthcoming and truthful with the Senate itself. I believe these allegations merit much more rigorous review.

Many of my colleagues believe that Iraq is at a critical and fragile juncture and that now is no time to delay the installation of our Ambassador to that country, and to them I say I could not agree more. However, I would also say to them it is even more critical that we send an Ambassador who has the proper experience for the tough task ahead of him. We should be sending someone who understands the complex and unique historical, cultural, and tribal intricacies of those with whom he will be interacting and negotiating. We should be sending someone who speaks their language, literally. We should be sending someone who, over their distinguished career at the State Department, has at least had one assignment to the Middle East. Ambassador Hill has had none. At no time during his 32 years has he had an assignment there, nor does he speak Arabic. Surely, the State Department has at least one distinguished diplomat who has career experience in the Middle East.

Some of my colleagues argue that Ambassador Hill's experience in Kosovo and Bosnia give him crucial experience solving complex problems of ethnic civil wars. After 6 years of, I would hope, lessons learned, I am sure my colleagues would agree with me that we should not approach the cultural and ethnic nuances in Iraq with a same-thing-only-different diplomacy. I certainly hope the Obama administration is not taking a one-size-fits-all approach to the world.

Iraq's history is not that of Kosovo or Bosnia. Its cultural and ethnic makeup is completely unique. We need someone who understands Iraq's history, culture, and, yes, language. That is why the choice of Ambassador Ryan Crocker was so inspired—a diplomat who, over his career at the State Department, had been assigned to Iran, Qatar, Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Afghanistan, and Pakistan—all before he took on his assignment as Ambassador to Iraq. In addition, he spoke Persian and Arabic.

Much of our recent success in Iraq is because of Ambassador Crocker's lifetime of knowledge and understanding of Iraq and its neighbors' cultural and ethnic history. While I don't expect a carbon copy of Ambassador Crocker, I do assert again that surely the State Department has to have at least one distinguished diplomat with relevant experience in the Middle East. If it doesn't—if its bench for Iraq is one diplomat deep—we need to find out what is going on over at the State Department.

Moreover, I worry what signal it sends—when coupled with the recent campaign rhetoric—of our commitment to sustain the hard-fought gains of the surge by sending an ambassador to Iraq with no experience in the region. What message does that send to Iraqi leaders who are nervous that the U.S. commitment to finish what we started has ended?

In addition to his lack of Middle East experience, recent press reports about Ambassador Hill's conduct as head of the U.S. delegation of the six-party talks on the North Korean nuclear issue raise serious doubts about his fitness to serve in such a sensitive position as Ambassador to Iraq.

Twice, Ambassador Hill allegedly disobeyed orders from the President and Secretary Rice not to engage in any bilateral meetings with the North Koreans. According to Stephen Hayes of the *Weekly Standard*:

On July 9, 2005, [Secretary of State] Rice had given approval for a trilateral meeting with the Chinese and the North Koreans in an effort to get the North Koreans to return to the six-party talks on their nuclear program. . . . The Chinese didn't show up, as they had promised. Hill nonetheless met alone with the North Koreans and gave them an important propaganda victory.

We cannot afford to have diplomats exceeding their authority and engaging in freelance diplomacy when they see fit and in direct opposition to the wishes of the President and the Secretary of State.

That is why Senator BROWNBACK and I wrote to Secretary Clinton and asked her to provide us with all relevant cables and correspondence regarding Ambassador Hill's instruction for these two meetings so that we can establish the facts. These matters could have been cleared up by now if the State Department had responded to the letter that Senator BROWNBACK and I sent. It has not chosen to do so. We have no response.

Finally, Senator BROWNBACK raised questions about Ambassador Hill's truthfulness to the Senate. The Senator spoke to this matter.

The position of U.S. Ambassador to Iraq is among the most sensitive missions we have in the world at this time. It is critical that ambassadors follow the letter and spirit of the orders given by the President and the Secretary of State. It is equally important that anytime an ambassador gives assurances to the Senate that something will be carried out, or certain actions will not be engaged in, that those assurances be rock solid.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have articulated—and I associate myself with the remarks of Senators BROWNBACK and MCCAIN—I regret that I cannot support Christopher Hill's nomination to replace Ambassador Crocker as U.S. Ambassador to Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for Christopher R. Hill to be the next Amba-

sador to Iraq. I have had the privilege of working with Ambassador Hill and I know him. He is a Rhode Islander. He was born in Little Compton, where he resides. He brought his fine skills and talents to public service many years ago. He has distinguished himself in that service over many years. He is being posted to one of the most critical areas of the world.

Mr. President, you and I just returned from Iraq. One of the comments we heard from General Odierno and from our diplomatic personnel was the need to rapidly confirm Ambassador Hill. They have every confidence in him. They believe he cannot only do the job but do it extremely well. I think their support is much more compelling than the opposition I have heard on the Senate floor today.

We understand, as they do, the real step forward in Iraq is building its governmental capacity and dealing with very explicit problems, one of which—and the Presiding Officer and I have both spoken on this today—is the tension between the Kurds and Arabs around Kirkuk, with respect to oil. Our Ambassador has to hit the ground running and deal with a very difficult set of issues. Chris Hill is prepared to do that.

Together with General Odierno, they will form a team that will continue the progress that has been made over the last several months.

Ambassador Hill, as I mentioned, is from Rhode Island. He earned his B.A. from Bowdoin College and a masters from the Naval War College, also in Rhode Island. He is extremely well qualified for this position, with a lifetime of diplomatic service and facing challenges in many different arenas, and facing them with distinction. He has particular skills in bridging gaps and bringing people together, which will be critical.

Ambassador Hill entered the Foreign Service in 1977. In the 1980s, he served in various positions within the State Department in Washington. He was an economic officer in the Embassies in Belgrade, Yugoslavia; Warsaw, Poland; and Seoul, Korea.

Beginning in 1991, he spent 2 years as the Deputy Chief of Mission at the U.S. Embassy in Tirana, Albania. From 1994 to 1996, he was the Director of the Office of South Central European Affairs.

Then, in 1996, he was named the Ambassador of Macedonia during a period when the United States was actively engaged in multilateral efforts to prevent the spread of ethnic conflict in Macedonia, bolster Macedonian independence and state viability, and manage bilateral disputes between Macedonia and Greece. He worked with our American military forces during that period.

The first time I met with him I was with the commander of the First Infantry Division of the U.S. Army who was on the ground. So the Ambassador is someone who has already been in a situation in which ethnic tension, bilateral relationships between regional

powers, and Army military stabilization operations were underway. I think that experience will make him extremely prepared for and equipped to accomplish the mission he has been assigned in Baghdad.

Ambassador Hill was also part of a team that was assembled by Ambassador Holbrooke that negotiated the Bosnian peace settlement. He fought to ensure that protections were included for those who had been made refugees by the war. In one instance, he personally intervened at the Stenkovac refugee camp to prevent a rioting mob from beating an ethnic Roma family to death.

I think he has a sensitivity to ethnic and sectarian tension, not gleaned from textbooks but from personal involvement and engagement in these situations.

In 2004, he returned to Seoul, Korea, this time as the Ambassador. There he partnered with Korean authorities and the commander of the U.S. Forces Korea, General Leon LePorte, another Rhode Islander, to develop and implement the most significant realignment of our military posture in the region since the Korean war. I think it was an effort that today is bearing fruit in terms of the ability of U.S. forces in Korea to continue their mission with a smaller footprint, and indeed to be able to support operations around the globe as units from Korea are being sent into the combat zone in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Most recently, after his experience as Ambassador to Seoul, he served as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs and also as head of—as somebody mentioned—the six-party talks, which attempted to get the North Koreans to move away from their path of nuclear progress they had been making. He worked hard to dismantle their main nuclear facility and provide a full accounting for their plutonium.

Ambassador Hill also engaged in issues of human rights. It has been pointed out that not all of the efforts have been completely successful. But what he was doing was carrying out the policy of the beneficiary administration. He was carrying out the instructions of the Secretary of State and the President of the United States. I think he did that with fidelity to his responsibilities to his superiors and also a keen commitment to improving a situation that had become very dire indeed.

Ambassador Hill has received numerous awards, including the Secretary of State's Distinguished Service Award, the Francis Shattuck Security and Peace Award, the Robert C. Frasure Memorial Award for Peace Negotiations, and the Secretary of Defense Medal of Meritorious Civilian Service.

Ambassador Hill, with his talent, his character, and his commitment to the Nation, has also been recognized because he has been endorsed for this position by the last three Ambassadors to

Iraq, including Ryan Crocker, Zalmay Khalilzad, and John Negroponte. These gentlemen did an extraordinarily good job for us there. I am particularly singling out Ryan Crocker—someone whose commitment was not just in terms of his professional skill but his physical skill—risking his life numerous times, working day and night, 7 days a week, and doing it with distinction and grace. That is remarkable.

Again, no one is going to be another Ryan Crocker. I think it is extraordinarily significant that Ryan Crocker, who probably knows that job as well as anybody, would endorse Christopher Hill to take the job. He would not do it just as a courtesy to a fellow State Department officer. He did it because I believe he understands that Ambassador Hill not only can do the job but will do it.

I also say the same thing about the commitment and sincerity and support of Zalmay Khalilzad and John Negroponte. Furthermore, I think both General Petraeus and General Odierno have indicated that not only is he someone with whom they can work, they want to be able to work with him quickly. They want him on the ground. Iraq is at a pivotal juncture in the history of that country and its relationship with the United States. The intelligence and commitment and experience of the Ambassador to Iraq is critical. Ambassador Hill has an abundance of the necessary skills. He has proven again and again he can bring a possible situation to a workable solution. He is the right man for the job. I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I strongly support the nomination of Christopher Hill, one of America's most distinguished and accomplished career diplomats, to serve as Ambassador to Iraq.

Our Baghdad Embassy is, obviously, a post of critical importance to United States interests. Our Armed Servicemembers and diplomats serving in Iraq need and deserve an ambassador without further delay. President Obama has set forth a sound strategy for ending our combat role in Iraq and allowing the Iraqi Government to take full responsibility for that Nation's affairs. We will be extremely fortunate to have an ambassador of Christopher Hill's skills, stature, and experience, to oversee this important new phase in our relations with Iraq.

Ambassador Hill's career in the Foreign Service spans more than three decades. He has extraordinary expertise and experience in the fields of national security, peacebuilding, and postconflict reconstruction. He is exactly the right person to have in this critical post at this pivotal time in Iraq.

While serving in the former Yugoslavia from 1996 to 1999, Ambassador Hill was at the center of negotiations for the Bosnia peace settlement, serv-

ing as deputy to chief negotiator Richard Holbrooke. He fought to ensure the protection of those who had been made refugees by the war. In one instance, he personally intervened at the Stenkovac refugee camp to prevent a rioting mob from beating to death an ethnic Roma family.

As America's first Ambassador to Macedonia, he worked with local authorities to quell ethno-religious violence and build institutions of democratic governance and civil society.

As Ambassador to South Korea, Hill strengthened a key bilateral alliance, partnering with Korean authorities and the commander of U.S. Forces in Korea to develop and implement the most significant realignment of our military posture in the region since the Korean war.

Most recently, as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Ambassador Hill led extremely complex negotiations to counter North Korea's nuclear ambitions, working with a diverse and powerful group of countries, including China, South Korea, Japan, and Russia.

Ambassador Hill has a master's degree from the Naval War College, and has extensive experience working with our U.S. military on counterterrorism and counterinsurgency. Ambassador Hill has worked with some of the best military commanders of this generation, addressing some of our Nation's toughest challenges GEN Eric Shinseki in the Balkans, GEN Leon LaPorte in Korea, ADM Tim Keating of Pacific Command, to name just a few.

Ambassador Hill's nomination has been endorsed enthusiastically by our last three Ambassadors to Iraq: Ambassador Ryan Crocker, Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, and Ambassador John D. Negroponte. We need his experience and seasoned judgment during this crucial time of transition in Iraq. Ambassador Hill's nomination has been vetted through the normal process. It is now time for the Senate to vote on his confirmation, and allow Ambassador Hill to get to work on the significant challenges ahead.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise today to give my remarks on the nomination of Christopher Hill to be United States Ambassador to Iraq. Unfortunately, I cannot support this nomination. There are two principal reasons for my opposition. The first is his inexperience in the Middle East and with the type of challenges provided by Iraq. The second is his actions and behavior during negotiations with North Korea.

It is generally accepted that career diplomats will serve in many very different parts of the globe. However, the position of Ambassador to Iraq is arguably the most important diplomatic post in the world to the United States. To see an example of just the type of person suited to this job one only need to look to the most recent U.S. Ambassador to Iraq: Ryan Crocker. Mr. Crocker previously served as Ambassador to Pakistan, Syria, Kuwait, and

Lebanon. He had served in Iraq previously and was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs. He is also fluent in Arabic.

Ambassador Hill has none of these credentials. He has spent nearly his entire career concentrating on European affairs, until recently shifting to the Far East to concentrate on issues regarding the Korean peninsula. He has no prior postings or assignments that would give him experience with the Middle East nor that would give him any knowledge of U.S. counterinsurgency efforts there. As the United States begins to draw down the military presence in Iraq, the efforts of our diplomats there will become even more important. We need a more experienced head of these efforts than we have been given in Christopher Hill.

Within Ambassador Hill's experience to date, I have severe concerns in the manner in which he conducted himself as chief U.S. negotiator in the disarmament talks with North Korea. Not only do I find his actions unprofessional but question his negotiating tactics and the concessions he made. Records show he engaged in evasive and unprofessional activities, including sidelining key officials at the State Department and breaking commitments made before congressional committees.

Ambassador Hill also made significant concessions to North Korea during his disarmament talks that I believe were diplomatically unsound and imprudent. I firmly believe they put the United States at a disadvantage in our efforts to move forward with this rogue Communist regime. Removing North Korea from our list of state sponsors of terrorism along with lifting our sanctions in return for a mere "good faith" declaration of their nuclear weapons program was unsound and irresponsible. True to form, North Korea, through a symbolic process of smoke and mirrors, only partially disclosed their weapons program giving the United States access to information that was already known throughout the international community. North Korea's recent decision to abandon the six party talks and restart their nuclear weapons program only highlights our failed diplomacy and Ambassador Hill's shortcomings.

As we move forward with one of the most diplomatically sensitive missions in American history I do not believe that we can afford to make any mistakes. While Ambassador Hill has a distinguished career of diplomatic service, I do not believe that he is the right nominee for this position. Thus, I respectfully oppose his nomination.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, there is a previous agreement that the final 10 minutes be equally divided, 5 minutes on either side, and I rise to use that 5 minutes in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, we are soon to vote on the issue of whether Chris Hill should be the next ambas-

sador to Iraq, and I want to make a few comments about that in closing.

I think there has been a good, full discussion, and I think it has been a good discussion. I misspoke at one point in time, in talking about Auschwitz and Poland. It wasn't a Polish concentration camp. It was in Poland, but it was run by the Nazis. I wanted to make sure I am clear on that to individuals.

Also, I wish to add Senator HUTCHISON to the North Korean Sanctions Act for the RECORD.

Today marks the Holocaust Remembrance Day, as cited earlier on the floor. The Holocaust Museum's theme this year is: "Never again: What You Do Matters." I think what Chris Hill did matters in this case.

I want to read one section of the statement from the Holocaust Museum and what they put forward about what you do matters. They stated:

Remembrance obligates us not only to memorialize those who were killed but also to reflect on what could have been done to save them. Those who survived tell us that as many faced their horrific deaths, their last words were "Remember us. Tell our story." Survivors promised that they would, and that never again would the world stand silent or look the other way.

Well, I can't stand silent and look the other way in North Korea. And I think "never again" ought to mean that. The deeds of Ambassador Hill in North Korea—no progress on human rights, a terrible deal, failed diplomacy—and I can go through what has happened in the last 2 weeks. To reiterate, North Korea has launched a multistage ballistic missile over Japan, kidnapped two of our citizens, pulled out of the six-party talks, kicked out international nuclear inspectors and American monitors, restarted its nuclear facilities, and according to at least one news source is now under investigation for shipping enriched uranium to Iran.

It was a terrible deal. In all this debate we have had about Chris Hill, not one colleague has defended the deal Chris Hill got with the North Koreans on its merits. Nobody has defended the deal he has gotten on the merits. They just said: Well, it is tough to negotiate. Yes, it is tough to negotiate, but on the merits, this was a terrible deal. And the irony is that the only thing dismantled in the six-party talks was our strategic deterrence and our moral authority. That was the only thing that was dismantled. Convening a six-party dialogue is not success in and of itself, especially when the result is so abhorrent.

We will have a chance to talk about this again shortly. It is going to be coming up in a supplemental. As a reminder here in the Chamber, then-Senator Obama said:

Sanctions are a critical part of our leverage to pressure North Korea to act. They should only be lifted based on North Korean performance. If the North Koreans do not meet their obligations, we should move quickly to reimpose sanctions that have

been waived and consider new restrictions going forward.

In the supplemental fight, there will be a discussion to give North Koreans more heavy fuel oil. I ask my colleagues not to put that in the bill. There will be a sanctions waiver discussion in the supplemental. I ask my colleagues not to waive sanctions on North Korea in the supplemental fight, and I ask instead that we reimpose the sanctions that then-Senator and Presidential candidate, now President Barack Obama called for in June of 2008. That seems to me to be an appropriate route for us to take as we look at this full set of problems we have and the discussion that we have had to date.

I ask my colleagues again to consider the qualifications of Ambassador Hill, the problems that have come under his watch, and the North Korean talks, and not confirm him to be our ambassador for Iraq in a situation where he has produced such terrible results and on a Holocaust Remembrance Day when we say: Never again.

I further ask my colleagues that if you do confirm him, if he is confirmed today, that we actually do remember that what we do matters and what we say matters and that we not go forward here at this point in time and say: Fine, we are going to go ahead and waive the sanctions. This was part of the Hill strategy toward North Korea; we are going to go ahead and waive these and we are going to let it happen anyway.

Mr. President, I realize I have used my time, and I do appreciate that my colleagues have let us have a full debate on this.

I yield the floor, and 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. KERRY. 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. KERRY. Mr. President, we have given Senators now a chance to air these grievances and raise questions and engage in a pretty full debate on the nomination of Chris Hill. I appreciate the issues my colleague has raised. I know he is deeply concerned about these, and has been one of the leaders in the Senate on the subject of human rights. We all respect that and we are determined in the course of our hearings and in the course of the work of the committee to keep that issue front and center, not just with respect to North Korea but with every country where those issues exist.

I do think it is unfair to suggest that Ambassador Chris Hill has done anything less than meet the standards we would expect with respect to his stewardship, both with the six-party talks as well as in the rest of his career, and I have talked about that a great deal.

We have heard the arguments and now is the time to vote. We need an ambassador in Iraq. We need this ambassador in Iraq.

This should not be a controversial nomination. Ambassador Hill is a proven expert negotiator. He is a problem solver and one of the best diplomats we have in the corps. As has been discussed, he has a great deal of experience with the skills that matter the most for the resolution of the remaining issues in Iraq, and he has been particularly involved in ethnic and sectarian conflicts not unlike those he will face when he gets over there. He has worked on multiparty international negotiations, and he is going to have to bring every skill he has learned in the fullness of his career to this task.

Particularly, I want to say we join Senator BROWNBACK in expressing the full concern of every Member of the Senate that we give meaning to the words "never again." That is a solemn responsibility. It is a solemn responsibility particularly on this Holocaust Remembrance Day.

But it is also clear from the record, from Secretary Rice's own words, that the decision to leave the Special Envoy for Human Rights out of these negotiations was not made by Chris Hill and we should not, in our votes today, hold that decision of his superiors against Chris Hill. It was a decision which Secretary Rice has spoken to publicly and I think we have addressed the major concern that was raised by the Senator from Kansas.

We have also shown the fullness of Chris Hill's own record on human rights and I think that record speaks for itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair and look forward to this vote. I hope it will be an overwhelming vote in favor of our ambassador to Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 386 be withdrawn, and that on Wednesday, following a period of morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, S. 386.

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

Mr. REID. There will be no further rollcall votes today, of course after the Hill vote. Tomorrow we will consider financial fraud legislation. I encourage those Members who have indicated to the managers interest in offering amendments or coming to speak on the bill, that they do that. I have spoken to the Republican leader today. He said he believes there are a number of amendments—not long in number—that the Republicans wish to offer. We solicit those amendments. There could be several amendments from this side also. It would be good if we could get to legislating on this tomorrow.

I also say I think it set a good tone. We should not have to file cloture on every motion to proceed. I appreciate very much the Republicans not necessitating that wasteful vote. This bill has been on the calendar and available since March 5. No one has to be concerned about not having seen this financial fraud legislation.

Members who have amendments should be ready to go forward with them tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Christopher R. Hill, of Rhode Island, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 159 Ex.]

YEAS—73

Akaka	Feingold	Merkley
Alexander	Feinstein	Mikulski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baucus	Gregg	Murray
Bayh	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Hutchison	Pryor
Bingaman	Inouye	Reed
Boxer	Isakson	Reid
Brown	Johanns	Sanders
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Byrd	Kaufman	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kerry	Snowe
Cardin	Klobuchar	Specter
Carper	Kohl	Stabenow
Casey	Landrieu	Tester
Chambliss	Lautenberg	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Collins	Levin	Voinovich
Conrad	Lieberman	Warner
Corker	Lincoln	Webb
Dodd	Lugar	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Martinez	Wyden
Durbin	McCaskill	
Enzi	Menendez	

NAYS—23

Bennett	DeMint	McConnell
Bond	Ensign	Risch
Brownback	Graham	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Shelby
Burr	Hatch	Thune
Coburn	Inhofe	Vitter
Cornyn	Kyl	Wicker
Crapo	McCain	

NOT VOTING—3

Kennedy	Roberts	Rockefeller
---------	---------	-------------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to re-

consider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FLOODING IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I have come to the floor to talk for a moment about the unprecedented flooding that has occurred in the State of North Dakota in recent weeks. My colleague, Senator CONRAD, discussed it some yesterday, and I want to discuss it as well.

We have had flood disaster assistance now approved for 38 of North Dakota's 53 counties, and it has been the most unprecedented, unbelievable flooding we have ever seen in the State of North Dakota. This chart I have in the Chamber shows, in red, the counties that have been declared disaster areas as a result of flooding. You can see it covers nearly three-fourths of the State of North Dakota. And we have had more snow, more moisture, more difficulty, more blizzards, and so on, and the rivers across our State have exceeded their banks and threatened very dramatic flooding, which I am going to talk about some today. But before I talk about the water, I want to talk about the people of North Dakota.

The unprecedented flooding that has driven people from their homes and caused so much damage and so much difficulty for so long has caused people in North Dakota to come together to do the most unusual things I have ever seen.

At midnight one night, I peered down the stairs of what is called the FARGODOME to see this large expanse. Inside this large dome building, at near midnight, I peered down on that floor, and there were thousands and thousands of people on the floor of that dome filling sandbags. They filled 3½ million sandbags in about 5½ days—3½ million sandbags in 5½ days. And they did not hire anybody to do that; they just put out a notice on the radio to say: We need people, and people showed up. The most unbelievable thing in Fargo, ND, was to watch what they did with just the people power that showed up. No one thought a group of people could do that, but they did—3½ million sandbags.