

the way Americans act and, in point of fact, that we have a system which encourages reporting of such incidents and which immediately ensures that the perpetrators will be dealt with in an appropriate way.

It is my understanding—and we will find out a lot more about this as time goes on—that the day after the report of the incident the inquiry began which resulted in military action, court-martial action being taken against several of these perpetrators, and subsequent to that, action has been taken against several people and that there are some that are still pending to be resolved. It is also my understanding that within the same month of January, a command had already been set up to investigate whether this was endemic or widespread, whether it really was an aberration and, to the extent that it demonstrated that there were flaws in our system that permitted this to occur, that they be fixed, and that things have been implemented to ensure this will not happen again.

I suspect as we are briefed on all of this we will learn a lot more of the detail, and we might be more comfortable with the way the military has handled this. This is what America is all about.

There is some fault, not only for the people who actually did what we have seen but also for the way it was handled. What I regret is that many in the political world have tended to focus on this. I would hope that opponents of the President would not seize upon this to try to gain partisan advantage. It is something that reflects on the entire country. It is not a Democratic or Republican kind of issue.

There have already been calls for the resignation of Secretary Rumsfeld. This, obviously, would not help the President politically, but is it appropriate? The Secretary will be presenting open testimony tomorrow before the Senate Armed Services Committee. He will tell his story. Until he does, I think it would be wise for people to withhold their judgment. Since we have not even been briefed on the issue—and that is one thing people complain about—would we have a right to call for somebody's resignation before we have even heard what they had to say or been briefed? Is that an American way to do things or is it an expression of partisanship?

I suggest to the extent it might be the latter, people should hold their fire and wait until the facts come in, and we can discuss this in a nonpartisan and a constructive way rather than a way that might be misread by our enemies, because the more this kind of criticism occurs, the more the enemy may take from it that America is divided and we no longer have the commitment or the will to see this conflict to an end; that therefore if they continue to try to nip away at us the way they have been, they will be able to drive us out, and they will have the country left to them to resume the kind of rule that Saddam Hussein exerted in that country for decades.

We cannot allow that to happen. I think there is a legitimate question about when the people in the policy-making part of the Government—and that includes the Assistant Secretary, Secretary of Defense, National Security Council, the President, and Vice President—became aware of things like the existence of photographs and other things which, if made public, would certainly significantly detract from our effort. These policymakers would clearly have understood that is the kind of thing that can undo countless hours of good work by thousands of military and non-military personnel in the country. Just one incident like this can undo all of the good that literally hundreds of people do.

We have all seen the acts of kindness as well as bravery by our troops. We have seen soldiers helping kids in school—saving a little child in one case and a woman in another case—from being in the line of fire, one of whom had been wounded. There are countless Americans acting unselfishly and, frankly, selflessly, putting themselves in danger to help Iraqi people. That is a message that obviously needs to be conveyed, but all of that is, in a sense, forgotten the minute you have an incident like this, especially with the photographs showing this.

I can understand how someone who committed these atrocities, unthinkingly, would have no idea about how this might affect the entire war effort when it becomes known, but people higher up certainly would have that sense. It was important that they get this information so they could then decide what to do with it. Undoubtedly, in America, ordinarily, we understand that the best way to deal with bad news like this is to deal with it in an open, honest fashion. I suspect that had we been able to do that, a lot of the outcry here might have been averted. That might have been included in briefing Members of Congress. But if the Secretary of Defense didn't even know of the existence of the photographs, it is kind of hard to brief Congress about it.

I suggest that the bottom line on this point is that we find out what the facts are by asking the people directly. Let's stop condemning them publicly and calling for their resignation and stop assuming facts we don't know.

During a radio interview that I just had, the questioner asked me about a certain situation. I said: I don't know that to be true. Do you? He said: No, but that is what we have heard. Let's see what the truth is, and we can act in a calm, compassionate, and firm way with those who did wrong.

My final point is that in the fog of war a lot goes wrong. Individual people make bad judgments. Americans are just as prone to that as anybody else. There is a lot of pressure and emotions run high, and it is certainly possible for people to do wrong. One of the candidates for President this year talked about atrocities he committed, or saw

committed, in another war in our history. It happens. It is not right, and people should be called to account for it when it happens.

But let's remember, too, that everything in war is not coming up roses every day, and that there will be days of bad news. If you stop to think about World War II, for example, or about Korea, or any other wars we have fought in, you can find some very bleak days, days when Americans were being pushed off the Korean peninsula, days when we were being pushed off Omaha Beach, or times when we were making no progress and were taking thousands of casualties on the Pacific islands. Our own prisoners were horribly mistreated, and there must have been a sense that this may not be worth the effort.

Americans understood the stakes and we persevered. In war there are going to be times that are bad. We understood that. Sometimes they are caused by enemy action and sometimes by mistakes we ourselves might have made. This is one of those times when we have a real problem because of mistakes that Americans made. But we have the capacity as a Nation to correct those mistakes if we will do that in a constructive way. That is the key. But if we do it in a partisan way, in a destructive way, we will only play into the hands of our enemies, who are looking for that kind of signal so they can succeed in their effort.

As we conclude debate on the nomination of a critical position at this time in our history, the ambassadorship to Iraq, it is good to reflect on these issues. The Ambassador will have a very difficult job. I hope as we consider his nomination and how to support him when he assumes this role, we will all agree it is important to do so in a constructive way, always giving him our best judgment, but not undercutting him with premature judgments or actions that might be construed as political and might be misunderstood by our enemy.

If we conduct ourselves in that way, I am confident that, despite the fact there will be days we feel very challenged in this country and, as the President said, things we are very sorry for, nonetheless, because of the kind of people and Nation we are and the values and principles for which we are fighting, we will in the end prevail, and we will prevail not only to the benefit of Americans and our national security, but for the cause of freedom of people throughout this world.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to speak regarding the nomination of Mr. Negroponte to be the Ambassador to Iraq.

THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

Before I speak on that, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to something that happened, on a very positive note, in the Republic of Georgia, one of the former Soviet Union

countries. It was reported today that one of the breakaway regions, Ajaria, has voluntarily come back into Georgia. The people have thrown out, vanquished kind of a local thuggish dictator, Aslan Abashidze, who had ruled this region for about 10 years. Thousands of Ajaris are now out in the streets, bringing Georgia back together, throwing out this guy who had been really a ruthless local, small-scale dictator in the region, and bringing the people back together of Georgia.

This doesn't get the publicity of Georgia's "rose revolution" of last November, but the people are rising up and saying they want democracy, they want to be part of this country. We need a change in leadership. They have done it by nonviolent means. It is inspiring to read about and to see that has taken place and that the Georgians who we are working with and supporting are getting this done. A number of people celebrating this victory are waving Georgian flags and American flags. A number of places in the world would not be standing free if it weren't for us, and they appreciate that.

Mr. President, now speaking on Iraq and Mr. Negroponte's nomination to the position of Ambassador of the United States to Iraq, he is an eminently qualified individual. I have worked with him in the Foreign Relations Committee. He worked in Central America, and he has been our representative in the U.N. He is the exact type of person we need to have in the region. He will take us from being the occupying power to a supporting role and not a governing role in Iraq. He understands that in a great way. Mr. Negroponte has great relationships around the world and he is a very wise man. I think he will do an excellent job for us.

We all lament what has taken place in the Iraqi prisons and the problems and images that created. But more than the moral outrage this has generated, these terrible acts by a few do a great disservice to the men and women who have already lost their lives in the effort to free Iraq and help the people of Iraq to govern themselves.

I had a closed town hall meeting with soldiers at Fort Reilly. They had recently returned from Iraq—about 300 Army men and women who had come back and served for an extended stay in Iraq. To a person, they were positive about the events that have taken place overall in Iraq. Yes, there have been problems and, yes, this is war. But they would talk about helping the children; they would talk about opening schools; they would talk about power services being brought back to levels higher, to pre-Saddam levels in that country. They would talk in glowing terms about what they are getting done on building a free, open, democratic Iraq.

Yes, problems, yes, difficulties, and, yes, lost American lives. We have had 37 people stationed at Fort Reilly killed in this conflict.

We have had a number of Kansans, as there have been people from all over the Nation, who have given their lives for the freedom of the people of Iraq and security for the people of American. We should not let the actions of a few do disservice to so many who have given their lives in this great and worthy cause.

The damage done to our credibility in Iraq and the Middle East is going to be difficult to rebuild, but we must do that in earnest. People must be held accountable, especially those in the chain of command with direct control over the prison system. Perhaps it is time this prison that has such a terrible legacy in Iraq in the Saddam era simply be closed, torn down, and never used as a prison again.

Let's keep in mind why we are in Iraq. I met with Jalal Talabani. He is one of the key leaders of the Iraqi Governing Council. He is a gentleman with whom I worked over the years as we moved forward in this country to confront the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein.

Let me give a very brief history lesson. He was involved in the Iraqi coalition, the diaspora. Actually, he is from the Kurdish part of the country, so he was in country. He has been involved in that group for some period of time seeking the United States to come forward and support the liberation of Iraq.

I remind my colleagues, in 1998, we passed the Iraq Liberation Act which called for regime change in Iraq. That was signed into law by President Bill Clinton who supported it. Mr. Talabani was involved in that effort from the outset. The Kurdish region has self-governance and has had it for the past 10 years and is doing remarkably well. He reminded me of a poll recently taken by CNN that had the Kurdish people supporting America and George Bush by over 95 percent and thankful for what is taking place, the liberating of their country and their region.

He also said this to me: It is shameful to us that we as Iraqis are sitting down and not taking on the role of governing and security within our country while American soldiers are being killed.

He said: It is our duty—the Iraqis' duty—to fight the terrorists, and we must do this as soon as possible.

I agree, exclamation mark, and we have to move in that direction. For years, the people of Iraq suffered under the brutal dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. There will be a trial sometime soon, hopefully this year, of Saddam Hussein. The world will see the atrocities, the hundreds of thousands of people buried in mass graves as a result of this man's rule.

Yet few—except for some countries in the region, Kuwait and Israel—dare to denounce Hussein for what he did to his own people. Especially those countries we call our allies in the Middle East, Egypt and Saudi Arabia, have failed to assume the moral leadership to tell about the Saddam Hussein re-

gime. We stepped into this void to do what others were unwilling to do. We did so grudgingly because going to war is never an easy decision for any country, particularly for America.

Even before the Iraqi war resolution in 2002, we spent years supporting the passage of one resolution after another at the U.N. to make clear that the Iraqi regime was an outlaw regime condemned by the international community. We engaged the American people. After a thorough debate in the Senate regarding the risk, this Congress overwhelmingly voted to give the President the legal authority to go to war in Iraq. We decided as a nation we did not want America to compromise its moral authority by avoiding the demands of leadership. We sought freedom for the Iraqis and for that freedom to spread throughout the Arab world, and we desired security for Americans.

It is a heavy burden. At critical moments in world history, we have not hesitated to carry this burden places far from home. Wherever we went, our men and women in uniform inspired others, bringing hope and freedom to millions.

I can quote a young man from Union Town, KS, who died in Afghanistan. I talked with his mother about his death and his service. He died at 21 years of age. His mother said: He e-mailed me home, and he said:

I would rather die for a cause than of one.

How better do we summarize it than that? He put his life on the line so others in Afghanistan, on the other side of the world, can be free.

On the interrogations, I understand interrogations are necessary in a war against a merciless enemy. But we have a long and honorable military tradition that is certainly not reflected in the photos from the Iraqi prison. Let's be guided by the moral courage to acknowledge our mistakes and to change what needs to be changed, and we will, and that is our pledge to the world. We need to behave better, be more humble, and understand that the war in Iraq, and the broader war on terrorism, is also a war of ideas and values.

Those who threaten our soldiers, our diplomats, and even ordinary Americans, as happened on 9/11, believe in hateful ideas. We do not agree with those ideas. We need to help the people of Iraq and others in the Middle East understand this war of ideas; that it is not something we can do for them, they must do it for themselves. Only the people of Iraq and the millions of Arabs who yearn for freedom can do that.

We must continue in our effort to give the Iraqis self-rule and free elections. These are our aspirations for the Iraqi people, and they are their aspirations as well. It is up to them to have the courage to move on, to realize these aspirations in a free nation that will bring democracy to their country and to the Middle East.

We have in Ambassador Negroponte the chance to start a new chapter. On

July 1, sovereignty will pass to the Iraqis. Ambassador Negroponte has enormous responsibility, and judging by his background, I cannot think of anybody better qualified to do this.

In his capacity as the Ambassador to Iraq, I know he understands his role to be fundamentally different from that of Ambassador Bremer. Whereas the CPA is the ultimate political authority in Iraq, the Embassy will be in a supportive, not commanding, role. His role is to provide support in democratization and rule of law, religious freedom and tolerance, economic reconstruction, and security and counterterrorism. His mission will be to further cooperation with the U.N., the international community, and independent Iraqi electoral authorities, and all aspects of election preparation, which is critical for elections for a transitional national assembly, no later than the end of January 2005.

He will need to assist the U.N. in establishing an independent electoral commission, an electoral law, and a political parties' law, encourage Iraqis to establish effective governing institutions in Baghdad and the provinces, as well as a myriad reconstruction efforts. This will be a critically important area because he will be responsible for holding these projects to the highest standards of financial accountability. He has the responsibility to the American people that the money for Iraq will be spent without waste and fraud, and in this context, he will need to encourage Iraq's new leaders to choose sound economic policies and enforce high standards of integrity in public administration.

Ambassador Negroponte will also need to play a key role in building and strengthening the capacity of Iraqi security services to deal with both domestic extremists and foreign terrorists so that they patrol and deal with terrorists in their country and our troops are garrisoned. He should continue to bolster the role of a robust multinational force, but mostly build up the Iraqi force.

Finally, he should make sure the role of the U.N. does not come at the expense of U.S. influence or interest, but rather the efforts be well coordinated and complementary.

Ambassador Negroponte has a big job. He is up to it, and I support his nomination to be Ambassador for the United States in Iraq.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFFEE). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority side has 80 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. We are on the Negroponte nomination?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I stand today in full support of the President's nominee to be our first ambassador to the new Iraq, Ambassador John D.

Negroponte. This is the most important nomination for an ambassador that we have considered in several decades.

This moment is historic.

We are asked to approve the President's choice for an ambassador to a country whose previous leadership was an enemy to America, to its neighbors and to its own people. That dictatorship, the brutal and bloody regime of Saddam Hussein, was removed by force, by a coalition of nations led by this country, in a military campaign where we still face, every day, bloody resistance from the remnants of Saddam's Ba'athist regime, his criminal associates, and the international jihadists who have joined forces with the tattered remnants of the Arab world's bloodiest regime.

We are engaged in a conflict we cannot, and will not, lose and the President has shown that our military determination is matched by our political determination to return this country to its people, beginning with the opening of an American embassy on July 1 of this year.

That we are providing our advice and consent on this ambassadorial nomination demonstrates that this President is dedicated to returning sovereignty to the Iraqi people. Under the President's direction, Ambassador Bremer and the Coalition Provisional Authority, working with the international community, now represented by U.N. Special Envoy Lakhdar Brahimi, have listened to Iraqi leaders and are holding to the deadline of June 30 for the transfer of authority.

That transfer of authority and the return of sovereignty require that the U.S. political presence be transferred from the office of the administrator, held by Ambassador Bremer, to a U.S. embassy, to be led, if this Senate approves, by Ambassador Negroponte.

Jerry Bremer and John Negroponte are two of the finest diplomats ever to serve this country. Their contributions throughout their careers reveal skill and dedication that will set the standards for our diplomatic corps for generations to come.

I truly hope that Ambassador Bremer, when his historic mission is over with the CPA, will continue to play a leading role representing our country to the world.

Ambassador Negroponte has represented our country to the world on many fronts, serving as ambassador in the Philippines, Mexico and Honduras. Most recently he has served as permanent representative to the United Nations, where he has been as our ambassador since September 18, 2001.

There are those who charge that this administration has been unduly unilateral, caustic to coalition-building, and dismissive of the diplomacy necessary to winning the war on terrorism that erupted on our land on September 11, 2001.

Frankly, that charge, now becoming a theme in a campaign year, leaves me baffled.

It reveals deeply flawed thinking, and deeply flawed perception.

Diplomacy cannot be measured by outcomes as expected by the multilateralists. This is a definition of diplomatic success that becomes a euphemism for subjugating national interest to international veto.

The citizens of Utah reject this thinking, and they are correct. And I believe the rest of the country does as well.

If diplomacy cannot be measured by multilateral consensus, it should not be shunted by unilateral arrogance. To suggest, as many on the left seem to do these days, that this administration has ignored diplomacy is to, in my opinion, ignore the facts.

This administration has been, in my opinion, extraordinarily engaged in the international community.

No President since the founding of the United Nations has been as respectful, solicitous and encouraging of the United Nations as has President Bush. That he has done so without ever sacrificing the fundamental sovereignty that rests in our Constitution makes him no less remarkable for the very public appeals he has made directly to the United Nations.

On November 10, 2001, fewer than 2 months after the most catastrophic terrorist attacks on our homeland in the history of the Republic, President Bush traveled from Washington to speak before the U.N., where he recognized:

The United Nations has risen to this responsibility. On the 12th of September, these buildings opened for emergency meetings of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Before the sun had set, these attacks on the world stood condemned by the world. And I want to thank you for this strong and principled stand.

Less than a year later, on the day after the first anniversary of September 11, President Bush traveled from the White House to address the General Assembly again, where he declared:

The conduct of the Iraqi regime is a threat to the authority of the United Nations, and a threat to peace. Iraq has answered a decade of U.N. demands with a decade of defiance. All the world now faces a test, and the United Nations a difficult and defining moment. Are Security Council resolutions to be honored and enforced, or cast aside without consequence? Will the United Nations serve the purpose of its founding, or will it be irrelevant?

The President answered the question:

The United States helped found the United Nations. We want the United Nations to be effective, and respectful, and successful. We want the resolutions of the world's most important multilateral body to be enforced.

Critics of this administration have declared that our doctrine of preemption, not a doctrine new to this administration, is incompatible with a desire for international consensus.

This is simply not true.

For a nuanced perspective, may I recommend a review of none other than Secretary General Kofi Annan's words,

in his address of October, 2003 before the General Assembly? In that speech, he was expected to denounce the doctrine of preemption. But while he stood by the principle of collective action enshrined in article 51 of the U.N. Charter, he recognized, as the honest man he is, that states which were threatened had to respond, and that if the United Nations were to retain its legitimacy in the 21st century, it would have to develop mechanisms to promptly address the threats of this new century.

In my view, this was a recognition, by the Secretary General of the United Nations no less, that in dealing with Iraq, 12 years and 14 resolutions without resolve could not be the way the United Nations retained its relevancy in addressing the security challenges we face today.

In that same week, President Bush addressed the General Assembly yet a third time. And I note that no President of the United States has addressed the General Assembly three times in one term. He declared:

The Security Council was right to be alarmed about Iraq. The Security Council was right to declare that Iraq destroy its illegal weapons and prove that it had done so. The Security Council was right to vow serious consequences if Iraq refused to comply. And because there were consequences, because a coalition of nations acted to defend the peace, and the credibility of the United Nations, Iraq is free and today we are joined in the General Assembly by representatives of a liberated country.

John Negroponte, as ambassador to the United Nations, stood by the President during those three historic addresses to the international community.

Today, the President has chosen our current ambassador to the United Nations, John Negroponte, to be the first U.S. ambassador to an Iraq liberated from tyranny.

Ambassador Negroponte has worked with the United Nations through this most historic of times. During this time, he worked closely with U.N. Special Envoy Lakhdar Brahimi on supporting Afghanistan after our forces deposed the Taliban. Ambassador Brahimi's efforts to guide the transition in Iraq from the Coalition Provisional Authority to sovereignty under an interim government has, as my colleagues know, the support of President Bush and his administration.

Ambassador Negroponte understands this. In his statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he said:

The prospect of legitimacy that the United Nations can bring to the process of political reconciliation is a point of crucial interest in both the region and the broader international community. With an expanded United Nations role in the political arena, I believe that it will be easier to generate the international support that the successful rehabilitation of Iraq requires. Secretary General Annan's and Ambassador Brahimi's contributions may well open the door to creative thinking about ways in which the international community, as well as the Coa-

lition, can further contribute to the process of rehabilitating Iraq, both politically and economically.

I want to be clear that a vital United Nations role does not come at the expense of the United States' influence or interests. Our efforts can be well coordinated and complementary; there is ample evidence across a broad range of situations that a strong partnership with the international community, including the United Nations organization, is in our strategic interest.

I hope my colleagues recognize that in supporting this nominee, we are supporting a man of exceptional experience, a man who represents the best thinking by this administration on the challenges we still face in Iraq. He is also a very good man, a good father, a good husband. He is an example to us all.

Let us be honest: The challenges in Iraq remain large.

Our engagement there is historic, and our commitment to support this engagement until we achieve success must remain strong.

As all of my colleagues, I have been shocked by the reports out of Abu Ghraib prison in the past weeks.

I have been shocked and I have been disgusted.

I join the people of Utah, and the good citizens throughout this country, in expressing how appalled we all are at the barbarous acts we have witnessed. In the prison that Saddam Hussein used to torture Iraqis, a few Americans have engaged in acts that demean Iraqis and besmirch the honor of Americans in uniform.

Every day, members of the American military are risking their lives in Iraq, in order to bring about a better society for the Iraqi people.

In combat, American military, the best trained in the world, have, time and again, exercised restraint of force in order to minimize civilian casualties. Sometimes that restraint has resulted in increasing the risk to our soldiers. That a handful of American soldiers committing brutalities in one of Saddam's reclaimed prisons could occur is worthy of all of our outrage—not least because we are proud of the honor and decency and sacrifice offered by the vast majority of our military in Iraq everyday.

We must expose what went on in Abu Ghraib prison. We must conduct full investigations, and follow those investigations wherever they lead. Those who committed crimes must and will be held accountable. Respect for the Iraqi people demands this, as does respect for the honor of all Americans in uniform, and all Americans who support them.

The security situation in Iraq is still hostile. We face enormous challenges, challenges we will meet. We have learned in recent days about the President's request for appropriations to fund our historic mission. This will lead to further debate, as it should.

Our duty as legislators is to render democratic scrutiny to the most important issues before this government.

If you want to support the transition to the first stage of Iraqi sovereignty, as the President has committed to do by the end of June, if you want to support continuing our appeal to the international community to join in the historic cause of rebuilding Iraq, and if you want to support this President, as he asserts his constitutional prerogative to conduct diplomacy at this most critical time in the history of our foreign policy, you must support his superb selection of John D. Negroponte to be the first Ambassador to an Iraq free of despotism.

He is certainly going to have my vote. I have met him in various nations around the world. I have seen him in action in diplomacy. I know what a brilliant man he is, I know what a good man he is, I know what a fine man he is, I know what a good family man he is, and I know what he has meant to the diplomatic corps in this country, and I know what he has meant at the United Nations.

I support him fully, and I hope every other Senator in this body will support him as well. There may be some who do not, but if they don't, they just plain do not know the man.

This is not an easy position. This is a position which will take a great deal of courage, a great deal of diplomacy, a great deal of common sense, a great deal of genius. This is the fellow who can provide all that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I do appreciate the opportunity to discuss my very good friend, John Negroponte, in support of his nomination to be the United States Ambassador to Iraq. John and I have known each other since 1977 with his appointment as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries Affairs with the rank of Ambassador. Because he handled several fisheries negotiations of vital interest to my state, John was a frequent visitor to Alaska. In 1978, John negotiated a breakthrough agreement with the Government of Japan which provided crucial protection for Alaskan salmon stocks from Japanese high seas fishing fleets. This agreement provided countless benefits to the Alaskan fishing community which endure to this day.

I have also had the pleasure of working with John in his subsequent assignments: as Ambassador to Honduras; as Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, as Ambassador to the Philippines and more recently as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. In each situation, I was able to witness

first hand his ability to manage large and complex diplomatic missions and to observe his effectiveness and sensitivity in dealing with his foreign counterparts.

Educated at Yale, he speaks five languages fluently—something that I consider a true asset for this position.

I believe President Bush, on the recommendation of Secretary of State Powell, has chosen extremely wisely and well in his selection of John to be our Nation's representative in Iraq. I also believe that at this point in time in our Nation's history, it is vital to have John at the helm in Iraq—we will need his expertise to help guide us through the next few months. I can tell you without any question, this man is one of the most distinguished public servants that I have had the honor of knowing and serving with. I know his family and I know this man.

With the unfortunate development we have recently had in terms of the conduct of some of the people involved in the prisons in Iraq, I am confident that John Negroponte is the man necessary to be there, in Iraq, to represent our Government. He will represent us well, and we will be very well served by his confirmation.

I urge the Senate to quickly confirm John Negroponte as our Ambassador to Iraq. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the time allocation for each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORZINE. I request permission to use 5 of those minutes and be informed when 4 minutes have been used of the time allocated.

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

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, like you, I sit on the Foreign Relations Committee and I reviewed the nomination of this experienced diplomat, our U.N. Ambassador, John Negroponte. I, too, both in the Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor, will have voted for his confirmation.

I do that, acknowledging, however, there are legitimate questions that can be raised about previous concerns in his tenure as an ambassador in Honduras, and human rights violations which are so important in the context of some of the things that are of great concern to us today.

But more troubling to me is the context in which this confirmation is actually being considered.

The reality is, once again we are doing something on the fly. We are rushing to confirm an ambassador to maybe the most important choice and role we have. In and of itself, it is indicative of the crisis we have in Iraq—frankly, the mess Ambassador Negroponte will be walking into.

If the administration—I am very troubled about this—sticks with an arbitrary, artificial June 30 deadline,

Ambassador Negroponte's job will begin in less than 2 weeks with little or no definition about what he will be doing. There are no secure or thoughtful political or security plans in place. We do not know who will be making those judgments, how those people will be chosen, their role, or what the true definition of sovereignty in the context of this June 30 transfer will be all about. We do not know how they will be selected. We do not know what the role of the Ambassador will be with regard to those individuals. It is very unclear what sovereignty means.

By the way, put into the most dramatic terms today, what is the role of the new ambassador with regard to what is happening to the prison guards? Who will be responsible for that? Sovereignty questions are totally unclear. We still do not have a structure for our forces and how they fit in and what we do going forward and what is the relationship with the United Nations.

This is a real problem. We continue with failed and confusing policies. They are true with regard to the U.S. Ambassador. But they reflect the basic incompetence we have seen with regard to our crippled occupation from the start, some might even say our crippled war from the start, because we executed this with real questions about what the justification was with regard to weapons of mass destruction in relation to al-Qaida. We have continued it with poor planning, or no planning, with regard to the occupation that has been in place.

Right from the start, there were questions about what the force structure needed to be on the ground. We have heard over and over again the warnings General Shinseki gave us, several hundred thousand troops, dismissed out of hand by the Pentagon. The administration has refused to talk about the cost of this occupation and what the cost to the American people will be, aside from the tragedy of the loss of life. When there have been predictions, they have been so far off base it has made no sense in the context of reality.

The administration promised or thought we would be greeted as liberators. We have been anything but that. Seventy percent of the Iraqi people believe we are occupiers. There has been serious resistance with the insurgency. By the way, history would have shown that would be the indication that would occur in the Middle East. But we dismissed every single outside expert, Member of Congress, who might have raised any questions about it and emphasized we had a coalition of the willing that was anything but a serious coalition.

Ninety percent of the cost, 90 percent of the troops, 90 percent of the effort, or more, were all American. It is an American occupation. The administration continues with these failed policies. As we go forward, I certainly think we see it very clearly in the lack

of clarity with regard to this tragic situation we see now with regard to the administration of prisons and detainees. The fact is, no matter what we do, every time the administration executes one of these policies, there is a flip-flop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CORZINE. The idea that we were not going to have the U.N. involved; now we have the U.N. involved. We were going to have de-Baathification; and then we have reentry of Baathis. The issue of deployment of troops.

I am supportive of this Ambassador, but it is high time we get a consistent, thoughtful policy that is vetted with more than a few, narrow interests inside the Pentagon and maybe inside the White House. We need to have a real discussion about the direction of our policies on occupation and transition of political power and sovereignty. It is too costly.

In the context of this series of events that all Americans are repulsed by, we need to stand back and say it is time to be thoughtful and fully vet the kinds of policies we are going to put in place because this is a long-term project.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I want to talk briefly about Ambassador John Negroponte and support his confirmation to be the United States' first ambassador to the free and democratic Iraq. Not only will he be the first ambassador to the free and democratic Iraq, but he will be the first ambassador to Iraq since the first Gulf War in 1991.

Ambassador Negroponte is one of the most experienced diplomats in the State Department. His experience is necessary for this job because he will be assuming one of the most challenging and important positions the State Department has ever had.

Throughout his career in the State Department, Ambassador Negroponte has been stationed at eight different posts covering most parts of the world. While he has not been previously stationed in the Middle East, I have no doubt in his ability to handle the task ahead. His experience representing the United States at the United Nations since September 11 and serving in nations like Vietnam and Honduras during periods of turmoil will guide him during Iraq's transition to democratic self-government.

Many challenges lie ahead for Iraq, including holding orderly elections, establishing government bodies, reconstructing infrastructure and the economy, and securing the country. The United States will be a partner for Iraqis throughout the coming challenges.

Critical to the successful transition to a sovereign Iraq is the participation of the international community. Ambassador Negroponte has earned respect among his colleagues while representing the United States at the United Nations. He will do a fine job

working with other nations to help Iraq flourish under the rule of Iraqis.

In summary, I believe President Bush has made a fine choice in nominating Ambassador Negroponte. I support his nomination and encourage my colleagues to swiftly confirm him to this vital position.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of John Negroponte to be our U.S. Ambassador to Iraq. When he takes his oath of office, Ambassador Negroponte will be our first ambassador to Iraq since the Gulf War of 1991.

I have had the pleasure of meeting with the ambassador many times over the last 3 years. He was a member of the Foreign Service from 1960 to 1997 and he is currently serving as the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations. His leadership there has been exemplary as he has provided our country with a strong voice and a presence at the United Nations that has been vital during these extremely difficult times. His experience at the United Nations gives him a great deal of insight into the thinking of the international community that will be invaluable in his new role in Iraq.

Soon Iraq will be welcomed back into the family of nations and the rights and freedom so cherished by the people of our nation will become a part of daily life in Iraq. Given our history in the region, I am certain my colleagues understand the wisdom of appointing an experienced diplomat with an informed opinion and a vision for the installation of a new government and the birth of a new nation of Iraq.

During our consideration of Ambassador Negroponte's nomination, I have heard some of my colleagues express their concerns about recent events in Iraq. That is understandable, because these are concerns we all share about this sensitive region of the world. We must not, however, allow those legitimate concerns to be politicized and used as a club against the President and his efforts to stabilize Iraq and introduce democracy there. Our soldiers' lives are on the line and we owe them every consideration while they are in harm's way.

Before anyone says I am being overly sensitive to the rhetoric of a campaign year, let me share with you a few of the details about what happened during a trip I took in April when I was able to visit wounded U.S. soldiers at Landstuhl Regional Medical Center in Germany. Before we met them, I was anticipating they would need some encouragement and we should try to lift their spirits after all they'd been through. The opposite turned out to be the case. They encouraged me and strengthened my spirit and resolve to see this through to the end. Every one of them, these brave men and women, said to me—"We are making a difference in Iraq. We know the people there. We know our job. We are doing our job and the people are responding to what we are doing. We are making a

difference and we want to go back there with our comrades so we can finish the job."

I don't believe anyone knows better than those who are serving on the front lines—those actually doing the work and living the dangers of life in a war zone every day. We have made a difference in Iraq. We have removed a brutal dictator from power and we are working with the Iraqi people to build a nation based on democracy and freedom. We are continuing to make a difference every day in the schools we help to build and operate, in the infrastructure we continue to improve and repair, and in the sovereignty of the people of Iraq which continues to command our deepest respect. We will continue to make a difference through democratization and the rule of law, economic reconstruction, and security and counterterrorism. By supporting all these areas, our diplomatic, civilian, and military personnel will make a lasting difference in the lives of the Iraqi people and they will, through their efforts have literally changed the world.

I hope my colleagues will remember that when we speak here on the Senate floor, our words are heard by those brave men and women overseas. Our words are heard by their families and their friends who make it possible for them to serve our Nation so well. They are also heard by our enemies who look to twist and distort our open discussions to make it appear that we have lost our will to see this through to the end. We must remember that fact each time we speak. If you wonder how I know if what I say is true, I can share my sources with you—our U.S. soldiers. They have asked me more than once: How come everything sounds so bad back home when it is improving in Iraq? We keep hearing this rhetoric which is based on the fight to win a presidential election, and it has nothing to do with what is happening in Iraq. Nonetheless, it has an impact on the morale and safety of our troops.

I have spoken here on the Senate floor about the importance of supporting our troops. I noted that we must remember to pray for our troops. When we do, I think we should also be praying for the opposition as well. We should pray that the hearts of those we fight will soften, and they will realize the role they are playing in the world and in Iraq. It is not too late for them to join us in the effort to build a better Iraq for all its people. Praying can make a difference, and it is up to all of us to do that every day. It is something we can do that is real and it has real power. With our faith, and our belief in our cause because it is just, we will continue to provide the brave men and women who serve in our armed forces, their spouses and their families with the support and encouragement they need and deserve by keeping them in our thoughts and in our prayers.

We also need to pray for those few soldiers at Abu Ghraib whose actions

were severely misguided as well as those who suffered the shame and humiliation of those acts. I have heard many speak today about tearing down this prison facility, and that is a good idea. Let's rid the world of this terrible prison and do it completely so that it will never house or harm another Iraqi.

I hope that people in the United States and throughout the world will remember that these deeds do not represent the character of any but a few misguided American soldiers. This should not be the image that the world has of our troops because it is not the truth. I am pleased that action is being taken immediately to address this situation. Charges are being levied, investigations are continuing, and changes are being made to the prison administration. We are blessed to have a truly exceptional military force whose image should not be tarnished by the actions of a few.

We have a job to finish in Iraq and we must not shy away from completing it. The more rapidly the people of Iraq are able to stand on their own, the sooner our troops will be able to come home. We have undertaken a job, and we cannot afford to fail to complete the task at hand.

I have often heard it said that exceptional times call for exceptional people to lead us through them. We must have someone in Iraq who is able to fully represent the United States at the time the Coalition Provisional Authority transitions out of the country. As the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee stated this morning, we cannot expect to wake up the morning on July 1 and have a fully functioning U.S. Embassy. The time to plan for that day is upon us and I encourage my colleagues to join me in taking the first vital step by supporting Ambassador Negroponte's nomination. With the confirmation of this exceptional individual, we will ensure that we have a strong U.S. voice on the ground and the right person in charge who will show the world the level of our commitment to Iraq. It will also underscore our determination to make life better for Iraqis for generations to come. It is a dream we share with the Iraqi people and, with the right people in charge, it is a dream that will come true.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to express my great admiration of our brave Montana servicemen and women in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere in the world. These brave men and women have put their lives on hold and on the line. Their families and their communities—our communities—support them. These Montanans and all American soldiers are in our thoughts and prayers. We want them to come home quickly and safely.

We need a plan to bring their mission in Iraq to conclusion. And we need the administration to communicate that strategy clearly to the world, and to our brave troops.

I am deeply troubled by the allegations of abuse of Iraqi prisoners. I was

horrified by the images we have seen over the last week. Our nation, which our men and women are serving with such honor, must lead by example if we want to win the global "war of ideas".

Although we know the vast majority of our men and women in uniform are serving honorably, these allegations of abuse demonstrate that we are not giving our troops all of the support that they need.

These images of prisoner abuse are not at all consistent with the principles I know our men and women in the Armed Forces hold dear. Our men and women went to Iraq to protect this Nation, to make the world a safer place. They have performed admirably under harsh conditions, sometimes with insufficient equipment, because they believe in their mission. I believe in them and I will continue to make sure that they get the support they need.

What our troops need now more than ever is visionary leadership. They need to know what their mission is and when that mission has changed. They must be trained for that mission and given all of the resources they need for it, be it body armor or bottled water.

In order to win the war of ideas and make the world safer, we must share our vision of how to win the global war on terrorism. Sharing the vision to win means building effective, lasting partnerships with not just other countries and governments, but international institutions. The whole world benefits from a stable Iraq. The U.S. needs to work together with other nations to share the risk and responsibility U.S. forces face today.

Sharing our vision of how to win the war on terrorism also means ensuring exemplary leadership for every private first class in the United States armed services. We want to ensure that the unconscionable actions of a few misguided soldiers do not endanger the mission of the thousands who work day in and day out to fulfill that vision.

This is why I supported the President's nomination of Ambassador Negroponte to be Ambassador to Iraq. This administration must demonstrate that it has not only the determination but also the vision to win the war on ideas that the war on terror truly has become.

Now is the time when we must share our vision with the troops who serve with dignity and honor, with the American people and with the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 5 minutes and the majority has 60 minutes.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, in a moment I will ask for a quorum call and then shortly after that, ask unanimous consent all time be yielded back and we proceed to the question on Ambassador Negroponte.

For the moment, having given a clear signal, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIDEN. 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. BIDEN. Mr. President, we are about to vote. I had an opportunity to speak earlier today. Let me conclude and then yield back whatever time remains by saying Mr. Negroponte is a serious diplomat with significant experience. When he appeared before our committee, he impressed me that he was more likely to be straightforward and unequivocal in answering our questions.

I will end where I began. I quite frankly think we owe him and his wife a debt of gratitude for being willing to take on what, without exception, in my view, is the most difficult and, at this moment, most dangerous job in U.S. diplomacy.

I urge my colleagues to vote for Mr. Negroponte, notwithstanding that they may feel, as I do, that this administration's policy on how to handle the circumstance in Iraq has been seriously wanting.

Do not confuse the lack of a coherent policy, from my perspective, anyway, with a lack of competence and ability of Ambassador Negroponte. I urge a yes vote on Ambassador Negroponte.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I appreciate again the assistance of the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator BIDEN, and, for that matter, all members. Many of the members of our committee, of which the distinguished Chair is a member, have spoken today, and have indicated they plan to support John Negroponte, as I will.

I think one reason why the committee has this feeling is that we appreciate the fact he has been forthcoming in response to our questions. He understands the gravity of the situation and its complexity. He does not have a doctrinaire point of view, but clearly recognizes the political realities in Iraq, in this country, and in our international relations.

As a part of his responsibilities at the United Nations, even as we speak, he is working with other nations on behalf of the best ideals of our country, and is attempting to bring to the people in Iraq the full possibilities that might come from much more intense and favorable and constructive relations with the United States and its allies.

I was impressed in our hearing with Ambassador Negroponte, that he has

been there many times before, in the sense of very difficult situations, tortuous circumstances, dangerous predicaments, ways in which he had to work with the elements of whatever administration he served, that may or may not have agreed with his point of view, but at the same time, through his experience and the gravity he brought to the issue, he was persuasive and effective.

Finally, I conclude by saying John Negroponte is not any more certain than Senator BIDEN or I am of precisely what is going to happen day by day in Iraq. It is a day-by-day story. And that is not all bad, in the sense that sometimes we make improvements day by day. Sometimes we are able to listen to the evidence, try to take a look at the rest of the world, talk to other people, consult more broadly.

But the fact is, I believe Ambassador Negroponte is prepared to consult. He is prepared to talk. He is prepared to open up. He is responsive to our committee, to the Senate and, I believe, to the Congress and, therefore, through us, to the American people, the people we serve.

The final point I want to make in this debate is I believe Members of the Senate are not unreasonable, I believe members of our committee are not unreasonable, in asking for discussion and consultation during these very difficult times, because the support of all of us—Democrats and Republicans, Americans—is going to be required.

I appreciate, on very short notice, the preparation for the hearing of the Ambassador. But I had the feeling he did not need much notice; that, as a matter of fact, he has been thinking about these issues for a long time. His responses indicated a degree of both maturity but, likewise, willingness to listen that I found very appealing and reassuring.

I encourage Members to vote for him so he might proceed to his duties.

Having said that, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available on our side and ask that the Chair pose the question.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John D. Negroponte, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iraq.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Exe.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Dodd	Lott
Alexander	Dole	Lugar
Allard	Domenici	McCain
Allen	Dorgan	McConnell
Baucus	Edwards	Mikulski
Bayh	Ensign	Miller
Bennett	Enzi	Murkowski
Biden	Feingold	Murray
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Fitzgerald	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Frist	Nickles
Breaux	Graham (FL)	Pryor
Brownback	Graham (SC)	Reed
Bunning	Grassley	Reid
Burns	Gregg	Roberts
Byrd	Hagel	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Cantwell	Hollings	Sarbanes
Carper	Hutchison	Schumer
Chafee	Inhofe	Sessions
Chambliss	Inouye	Shelby
Clinton	Jeffords	Smith
Cochran	Johnson	Snowe
Coleman	Kennedy	Specter
Collins	Kohl	Stabenow
Conrad	Kyl	Stevens
Cornyn	Landrieu	Sununu
Corzine	Lautenberg	Talent
Craig	Leahy	Voinovich
Crapo	Levin	Warner
Daschle	Lieberman	Wyden
DeWine	Lincoln	

NAYS—3

Dayton	Durbin	Harkin
--------	--------	--------

NOT VOTING—2

Kerry	Thomas
-------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. LUGAR. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CRAIG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

The Senator from Idaho.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CRAIG. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska and I be allowed to speak as in morning business for no more than 10 minutes.

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

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, we would like 10 minutes following the Senator from Idaho as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Chair.

DEMOLISHING ABU GHRAIB PRISON

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, today the Senator from Nebraska and I are introducing a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I will read it because I think it is

appropriate at this time, when all of us are tremendously frustrated about what has gone on in a certain Iraqi prison.

Expressing the sense of the Senate that the Abu Ghraib prison must be demolished to underscore the United States' abhorrence of the mistreatment of prisoners in Iraq.

Whereas the Abu Ghraib prison was used by Saddam Hussein to execute and torture thousands of men, women and children;

Whereas Saddam Hussein and his Special Security Organization oversaw the execution of thousands of prisoners;

Whereas Abu Ghraib prison is notoriously known as a death chamber by the Iraqi people;

Whereas the Abu Ghraib prison is arguably the largest and most feared prison in the Arab world;

Whereas it is widely known that one of Saddam's sons, in one day, ordered the execution of 3,000 prisoners at the prison;

Whereas the recent reports of the atrocities and abhorrent mistreatment of Iraqi prisoners in the Abu Ghraib prison are un-American, do not represent our values, and have sent the wrong message about the United States intentions in Iraq;

Whereas the American people will not tolerate the mistreatment of Iraqi prisoners;

Whereas the American people view this prison as a symbol of evil, and where past cruel torture and mistreatment occurred;

Whereas the American people would like to rid the world of this evil place where past and, unfortunately currently reported mistreatment has occurred;

Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Abu Ghraib prison, also known as the Baghdad Central Detention Center, be completely demolished as an expression and symbolic gesture that the American people will not tolerate the past and the current mistreatment of prisoners.

We are offering this sense-of-the-Senate resolution today because we believe it is a profound and clear expression of the American people's concern and it is a sense of this Senate that we do not accept the treatment that has gone on there of Iraqi detainees.

I yield the floor now to my colleague from Nebraska for a similar expression, and I send this resolution, as proposed, to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. I thank my colleague from Idaho for this opportunity to express our outrage at the behavior of Saddam's henchmen and for the disgust we have for what some misguided soldiers apparently did in conjunction with the trust they had imposed on them in conjunction with prisoners.

We cannot erase what has been done. We can apologize for it. We can express our outrage. We can say to the American people and to the people of the world, this is not our way and we do not condone it, but we cannot change it and we cannot erase it. I think what we can do is make the broadest statement we possibly can symbolically by leveling this prison.

It seems as though the demons of the Saddam regime carried on in the disguise of Americans who under ordinary circumstances would not have been conducting themselves in this way.

I do not believe in those ghosts, but I do believe the message that can be sent is a very strong one: We do not condone this kind of behavior. The very behavior we went to eradicate needs to be eradicated once again. Those who are criminally responsible must be held to the letter of the law, and those who are responsible in the chain of command must also be held to the highest standards of our military.

I think we can say to the Iraqi people more than we are sorry, which we are, more than we wish it had not occurred, that we stand with them to eradicate this kind of behavior once and for all, at least in that prison. Perhaps symbolically it will help all recognize this kind of behavior is unacceptable anywhere in the world.

I have traveled with my colleagues to various parts of the world, to South Korea, the Baltics, Afghanistan, and Iraq, and those photos do not represent those men and women who serve our Nation honorably or share the values we Americans hold dear.

This prison was the tool of a violent, repressive regime. It is as much a symbol of Saddam's regime as the statues honoring him throughout Iraq. It is even more so in many respects because it represents the truth of what his rule was. Just as those statues were torn down, so should this prison be torn down. This place has become a symbol of abuses and atrocities first under the regime and now sadly with the new acts committed by our troops. We need to make a clean start. What happened in that prison is not American. It does not represent our values, and we need to let the rest of the world know in the most visible way possible that these acts which were committed in that prison are not the American way and not the way America conducts itself.

We need to make a break from the past. We need to level this prison. The symbol of atrocities, this home of abuses, should stand no longer. Let that be our stand, to tear down the prison, to hold those accountable who have engaged in such activities as we have held Saddam accountable, and let us move on so we can say to the people of the world, this is a new start, a break from the past. Let us join with the Iraqi people in building a new Iraq, one that is founded not on the abuses