

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans throughout this country share my growing concern about the alarming language being used to demean anyone raising questions about American policy in Iraq. But we have been there before.

We have endured the excesses and the shame of the Palmer Raids, of McCarthyism, of J. Edgar Hoover, and Nixon's Enemies List. It is a sad, but historical, fact that in these times of national crisis and stress, some resort to challenging not merely the ideas of our fellow citizens, but their character, their integrity, and even their patriotism.

Some would prefer that we ignore such blasphemy, that we treat such exaggerated rhetoric with the indifference it deserves. I respectfully disagree. I believe that we have learned a sad lesson from history of this and other countries that ignoring vicious political slurs encourages further abuse and undermines free speech and open debate.

We have substantial disagreements about the wisdom of our course in Iraq. Those who disagree with our policies include highly decorated veterans, intelligence experts, some of our closest allies and millions of our constituents, a growing number every day.

And yet, when a widely respected Member of the House, an honored veteran who has been a staunch supporter of the defense community through 30 years of congressional service, offered a somber analysis about the misdirection of our Iraqi effort, he was denounced by other Members as conducting "a calculated and a craven political stunt."

Now, the author of that statement has a tendency towards loose language and personal invective, and most people do not take his words too seriously. I do, because he is the majority leader.

He was speaking about our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA.) He called him "craven." The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), craven?

Craven is a strong word. It means gutless. It means spineless. It means cowardly, weak, fearful. It is a word that should never be used by a Member of Congress to describe another, and could never be used to describe the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

□ 2015

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) joined the Marine Corps during the Korean War. He volunteered to serve in Vietnam, while those who accuse him managed to avoid military service. He is the first combat Vietnam veteran elected to Congress. He retired from the Marine Corps Reserves in 1990 and has been awarded the Navy Distinguished Service Medal and the USO's Spirit of Hope Award for his many services to the men and women in the military.

To even suggest that his impassioned and difficult statement about the course of the war in Iraq was a "political stunt" is to insult a distinguished veteran and Congressman, and I denounce it in the strongest terms.

But the voices of hysteria did not stop there.

Now we are told that those expressions of concern about the misdirection of the Iraqi campaign demonstrated that "the national Democratic Party declared its surrender on the war on terror." Democrats were accused of giving "aid and comfort to the enemy," according to another Republican Member who never served in combat.

Let every American understand the meaning of these words: It does not matter who you are, if you have worn the uniform of your country, if you have risked your life in combat; to those who use these words on the floor of the House, it does not matter. Challenge the policies of the Bush administration and House Republicans in Iraq, and you are "giving aid comfort to the enemy." You are surrendering to terrorism.

In other words, you are a traitor. That is what these Republican Members would suggest about Members of Congress.

Well, according to the latest poll, 60 percent of the American public think the situation in Iraq is out of control. Have we become a Nation of traitors in the eyes of the Republican leaders of this institution?

Mr. Speaker, this disgraceful, demeaning, and insulting rhetoric has no place in the Congress, it has no place in America, and it should be denounced by every Member of this House, regardless of party and regardless of one's position on Iraq. The day we lose our ability to voice our heartfelt views without having our patriotism demeaned is a dangerous day for democracy.

Some may argue that these are just the voices of an extreme, though powerful few. Some say it is just partisan politics. That is not the case. We have been here before.

Two years ago, the patriotism of Senator Max Cleland was challenged, a man who served in Vietnam and left three of his limbs there; a man who served honorably as the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs and as a United States Senator. Apparently he did not lose enough limbs to prove his patriotism to those who attacked him, those who sought multiple deferments in the same war that cost Max Cleland his limbs. Those attacks cost him an election, too.

This year, the vicious attacks are leveled, as we knew that they would be, against Senator JOHN KERRY, who volunteered in Vietnam while others used their connections and deferments to avoid service. Senator KERRY earned three Purple Hearts, a Silver Star, and a Bronze Star, but now his patriotism is also challenged. Evidently, Senator KERRY's wounds were not deep enough for some of his critics.

And now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) is the target of this disgraceful, venal slander.

It is time to stop.

Americans deserve, and they want, an honest discussion on the issues, not a vicious assault on the integrity and the patriotism of distinguished men who carry their wounds of war.

WHERE IS THE OUTRAGE?

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, like so many Americans and citizens of the world, I watched the news with disgust as they announced the beheading of Pennsylvanian Nick Berg, a young man, 26 years old, who was working in Iraq as a civilian. Somehow, Abu Musab Zarqawi and other al Qaeda decided it was time to show us, once again, their version of justice which, to we Americans, is more of what we call murder.

Repeatedly, the stations talked about this and then cut back and forth to hearings taking place here on Capitol Hill to review the hearings about the Abu Ghraib prison and the terrible behavior of several soldiers there.

I was struck by the idea that while the actions of the soldiers in the prison were reprehensible and that they should face court-martial, I am also wondering where is the outrage about the murder of an American citizen? Where was the outrage also about the four contractors who were killed, their bodies mutilated, drawn and quartered and hung and burned? Where was the outrage about the terrorists living in Iraq and showing us the way that they see the world: innocent citizens who had no trial, because no trial could be held, because they committed no crime.

But it continues to give us a flavor of what we are up against when we note how terrorists view Americans and view Western culture and the world. Whether or not we are in Iraq, whether or not we are in Afghanistan, they will continue to perpetrate their war to kill us; not because they want land, not because they are seeking economic gains, but simply because they feel they are on a mission to kill anyone who is Western, who is from America, who is Christian or Jewish, and they will not stop until they have killed us or we have killed them.

But let us not forget who Abu Musab Zarqawi is. He is not just someone who appeared on television today.

World history tells us that in 1999, Zarqawi planned a terrorist attack for the millennial celebration in Jordan. The Radisson Hotel in Aman and other American, Israeli, and Christian cites were targeted. The plot was discovered before it was carried out, and Zarqawi escaped before he could be indicted.

In 2000, Zarqawi went to Afghanistan where he oversaw a terrorist training

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.