

camp. He also specialized in chemical and biological weapons.

In 2001 Zarqawi was sentenced to 15 years for his terrorist plots in Jordan. However, since he escaped before he was arrested, he has not served any of his term.

In October 2001, after the Taliban lost control of Afghanistan, Zarqawi fled to Iran with a wounded leg. While he was there, Zarqawi dispatched two Palestinians and a Jordanian who entered Turkey, and then they were supposed to go to Israel to conduct bombing attacks.

In February of 2002, the three terrorists who were sent by Zarqawi were caught in Turkey.

Then in May of 2002, Zarqawi traveled to Iraq; yes, Iraq. He had his leg amputated and had a prosthetic limb to replace it.

From May through July of 2002, Zarqawi spent time recovering in Baghdad and, at the same time, several extremists also came to Baghdad and established a base of operations.

In the late summer of 2002, Zarqawi traveled to Lebanon to meet with leaders of Hezbollah, another terrorist group.

And then in October of 2002, Lawrence Foley, a United States official with the Agency For International Development was assassinated, and after some arrests were made of the actual shooters in December of 2002, Zarqawi was linked to the plot by providing the murder weapons.

In early 2003, Zarqawi returned to the Ansar al-Islam camp in northern Iraq. Other terrorists who have trained in this particular camp have plotted chemical attacks with various toxins in Britain, France, Georgia, and Chechnya.

In January 2003, several terrorists were arrested in Britain for planning to put the toxin ricin in the military food supply. These terrorists were linked to Zarqawi. He continues on with his murderous ways.

It is important to note that as this history tells us that indeed this terrorist was plotting in Iraq, this terrorist was working in Iraq to train other terrorists. But where is the outrage? Where is the outrage among us?

Instead, we talk on and on, snipe back and forth, point fingers, call each side names on both sides of the aisle, trying to score political points instead of trying to achieve peace; looking at polling numbers, and not working on policy.

It is time that we lay these things to rest and look at the outrage and look at the ties that bind us and say, this is why we are fighting terrorism. It is to stop the murders, and it is to ask ourselves where is the outrage of their behavior.

MISMANAGEMENT IN IRAQ THREATENS AMERICAN TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, the scandal at Abu Ghraib prison is indeed a stain on our national honor and a grave disservice to the brave men and women of our Armed Forces. More importantly, it is a threat to their safety in the field, as these despicable pictures have increased the fury of our opponents as they fight against us.

Only two items I think reflect in any form or fashion of positive sense for the United States. Actions speak louder than words. Two things may be positive actions. First, the apology of the President and the Secretary of Defense, in a rare display not of humility, but at least of a sense of concern for the feelings of others around the world and, in particular, in the Muslim world. This was a good thing. Second, and I think this is very important, the serious congressional hearings and investigations that are underway now are shedding a great deal of light on the scope and nature of abuses. We are showing the world how we respond when our misdeeds are uncovered, and that is a great example of our democracy: public, transparent hearings and investigations. Compare this, then, with the barbaric terrorists who hide behind masks when they commit acts of terrorism, assassination and, most recently, beheading.

However, unfortunately, apologies and investigations are not enough. The Taguba report says we have in this country a failure of leadership at the highest levels. I find it ironic in this context, then, that the President says that Mr. Rumsfeld, Secretary Rumsfeld is a superb leader. I beg to differ.

First, Secretary Rumsfeld was a party to false and misleading prewar intelligence and analysis. There are no WMDs, weapons of mass destruction, and we have not been viewed as liberators. I am someone who put aside partisanship based on representations made by this administration that there were, indeed, legitimate threats to our security.

Second, we find that Secretary Rumsfeld engaged in inadequate planning for postwar transition. We simply do not have enough troops. Not just Democrats are saying this. Experienced retired generals have said, almost unanimously, we do not have enough troops to do the job that we are required to do.

What about winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqis? We are losing. We are actually creating recruiting posters for terrorists, because the Iraqis have not seen us as liberators, they have seen us as an oppressive force. This administration has not done the things that would convince the Iraqi people that we are there to do them good.

One minute the Baathists are out, the next minute the same old Baathist generals are back in. How does that work for an administration that describes Secretary Rumsfeld as a superb leader?

This is the same Secretary Rumsfeld that set aside the Geneva Conventions and then wonders why we are having this problem at Abu Ghraib. Well, he set the tone. This administration and Secretary Rumsfeld bear the responsibility for inadequate planning of confinement facilities and for inadequately training our military police.

We heard one of our colleagues on the Republican side talk about all of the great accomplishments that our troops have done. Unfortunately, those accomplishments are undermined by this scandal and these outrageous pictures of sexual abuse of prisoners at the hands of our own troops.

What about the role of military intelligence in directing Army MPs to "set the conditions" and "soften them up?" This too falls at the feet of Secretary Rumsfeld. This is a great disservice to our men and women in the field.

Not only is this prisoner abuse a disgrace, it is the kind of behavior that we condemn on human rights grounds in other countries such as Cuba and other Third World countries. I am sure those countries now understandably scoff at our high-minded words.

We have created tremendous anger and hostility towards the United States by the Iraqi people and around the world. This will make the job of bringing stability to Iraq much more difficult.

What is to be done? First, we must hold those up the chain of command accountable. One of the things that concerns me as we review this scandal is that a few sergeants and privates are being made scapegoats for a failure of leadership at the highest level.

Second, since we are about to turn over sovereignty to the Iraqis, perhaps now would be a good time to invite them in as a show of good faith and let them serve as observers, those who have been properly screened, in the prisons to say that yes, we are not only turning over sovereignty, we have nothing to hide.

Finally, we need more troops. The generals have said it, the Democrats have said it. Most people realize we have not managed this war well. More troops would help us do a better job and help ultimately to protect our troops.

IRAQ OIL FOR FOOD PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address what I believe to be important facts about the United Nations Oil for Food Program with Iraq and how it ultimately was corrupted by Saddam Hussein with the aid and willing cooperation of allies from the international community.

□ 2030

In addressing this issue, Mr. Speaker, a few simple facts should be reiterated.

In February of 2000, President Clinton's administration registered their dissatisfaction with Saddam Hussein's government when he complained that approximately \$2 billion was spent to build nine lavish palaces and import liquor and cigarettes under the Oil for Food program.

During the postwar occupation, some very serious allegations have been made regarding people and corporations who circumvented the Oil for Food program by receiving illicit payments from oil surcharges. Among those implicated were U.N. officials administering the Oil for Food program. This was first reported by Al Mada, an independent Iraqi newspaper. Some people and organizations who have been accused have been confirmed in this account to have violated the program. Others have so far denied it.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a tremendous number of companies signed oil exploration contracts with Iraq that would ultimately have served to undermine any remaining viability of the Oil for Food program. Not surprisingly, the companies predominantly seemed to have come from countries which opposed the liberation of Iraq.

Just this March, the General Accounting Office testified before our own Committee on Financial Services that it believed that Saddam Hussein's regime increased its revenues through illicit activities in the Oil for Food program by approximately \$10.1 billion between 1997 and 2002. These funds were spent to oppress the Iraqi people and provide a lavish lifestyle for the regime's rulers.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear. Saddam Hussein engaged in an ongoing circumvention of the Oil for Food program, flouted the U.N. resolutions, persecuted his own people, and was engaged in widespread corruption. He was assisted in these activities by a number of companies and perhaps countries, as well as people within the U.N. bureaucracy itself. This is just one more example that gives credibility to our campaign to remove the regime of terror and replace it with one that truly represents the Iraqi people.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the Oil for Food program, Iraq was able to successfully advance its foreign policy by offering future contracts to companies for oil exploration, thus receiving a buy-in from other countries, bolstering Saddam Hussein's legitimacy.

The Oil for Food program was suspended just before Operation Iraqi Freedom began on March 19, 2003. The U.N. staff in Iraq departed on March 28, 2003. As U.N. forces moved north towards Baghdad, the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 1472, restarting the program's operations, empowering the United Nations to take direct control of all aspects of the program, and directing the United Nations to set priorities on the delivery of already contracted supplies. This actually enhanced U.N. authority and then was later extended on June 3, 2003, a re-

markable usurpation of power given the record of the U.N. up to that time administering the program.

On May 22, 2003, Resolution 1483 was adopted, lifting sanctions on Iraq and providing for the phasing out of the Oil for Food program's ongoing operations within 6 months. In accordance with the resolution, the program was terminated on November 21, 2003, and was taken over by the U.S. occupation authority, the Coalition Provisional Authority.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues can be assured that the CPA is now more effectively delivering food and resources to the people of Iraq than Saddam Hussein ever did. Today, Iraqi resources are being used for the Iraqi people for the first time in decades. Our achievements are impressive in this area and should demonstrate our commitment to the people of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I would once again call for a full and thorough investigation of the expenditures of all funds involved in the Oil for Food program. The corruption was so deep in the Saddam Hussein administration and in those countries, companies and international institutions that propped up the regime, I am convinced that we will not like what we discover.

IRAQ ABUSES MAY GO UNPUNISHED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to suspend your emotions for a moment and look closely at the pictures from Iraq. The Americans appear to be dressed about the same, but there is one major difference. Some of the photos include U.S. soldiers and U.S. civilian contractors. In fact, in one photo the civilian contractors are turned away from the camera. Maybe they were trying to protect themselves. From what?

Some of the U.S. soldiers involved will face a military court martial. The civilian contractors will not face a military court or an Iraqi court or an American court. Civilian contractors involved may not face any punishment thanks to the Pentagon.

Secretary Rumsfeld outsourced the President's war. He outsourced the checks and balances. He outsourced the chain of command. He outsourced due process.

The Pentagon wrote an order that specifically protects civilian contractors from prosecution in Iraq for crimes committed under the umbrella of official duties, and if a civilian contractor commits a crime while off duty in Iraq, U.S. Administrator Paul Bremer has to agree in writing to local prosecution. Does that sound like the United States? Is this the model of democracy we are trying to install in Iraq? Does this sound like adhering to the Geneva Convention?

Last week, the Attorney General rushed to the microphones to tell America that he can prosecute civilians implicated in Iraqi crimes, but the Attorney General neglected to tell the American people that not a single FBI agent has been dispatched to Iraq to investigate. Not one. When two U.S. embassies were bombed in Africa during the Clinton administration, 900 FBI agents went to the scene. The Attorney General says he will wait until the Pentagon finishes its investigation. What is he waiting for?

The International Red Cross has been sounding the alarm for over a year, but the administration and its war machine turned a deaf ear and a deaf eye to what was happening. Now the United States and every soldier is paying the price for benign neglect.

Civilians were given authority to interrogate, clearly using any and all means. Civilians had some mission control over U.S. soldiers, and they exploited this control.

Civilians were immune from local prosecution and immune from military chain of command. We know there has been torture and likely even murder; yet some soldiers were involved, but we cannot stop there and pretend that is the end of it.

There are thousands of civilian contractors in Iraq. We owe it to every good and decent American soldier to get to the worst black mark in military history. We must know what role, secret or otherwise, the civilians were playing in the war. What else were they given besides protection? What secret orders are they carrying out? Who is accountable for the civilians? What assurances will the Iraqi people have that any civilian implicated will be brought to justice? How can we say that we stand for freedom if we let the criminals go free?

The U.S. military told the administration before the war that hundreds of thousands of troops would be needed. The administration refused to listen. Instead, the administration deployed a hand-over strategy concerning Iraq. The administration handed over critical duties to people outside the military and then protected them.

The administration keeps talking about handing over Iraq on June 30. They have already handed over to the wrong people. We need to get back in control of what is going on in Iraq. This administration has got to come clean on what those contractors were hired to do, by whom, and who supervises them.

Are there bosses in Virginia that run those companies? Are they exempt, too? Is nobody responsible for the interrogations that went on in that prison or in the other prisons in Iraq?

These are the questions that must be answered by this administration, and I am afraid that if Mr. Rumsfeld does not want to do it, he is going to have to go.