If the gentleman would yield, I think that in the

context gentleman has just enunciated, that the notification to the

Congress this afternoon of the $25 billion request is in order for

examination. It is characterized as a ``supplemental package.'' There

is nothing supplemental about this. This is an ongoing cost, an

expense.

What is being outlined here in terms of what private contractors are

doing, the package that has been put forward by the White House says it

is for military operations in Iraq and the war on terrorism.

Now, I realize, and I think the gentleman would agree, that this has

to be paid for. We cannot leave our troops out there without their

proper equipment, many of the things that speakers in Iraq Watch have

brought up before on this. But would the gentleman agree then, before

this $25 billion is voted on, we need to find out where this money is

going, who is going to get the money, what are the operations that are

envisioned?

If the gentleman will yield further, last evening I

had an opportunity to speak in a special order, and I indicated then

and I indicate again tonight in the wake of the gentleman's suggestion

that the President was ill-served by those in authority who failed to

inform him fully as to what all the conditions and circumstances were.

There is no excuse for the leadership in the Department of Defense

not informing the President of the United States as to what he might be

facing with respect to the outcome that was here. I pointed out last

night that this situation did not just develop with CBS on 60 Minutes

II within the last 7 days. A report by the Provost Marshal of the

United States Army, Major General Donald Ryder, in November of 2003,

was in the hands of General Sanchez and in the hands of the Department

of Defense and the Secretary in the fall of last year.

In the wake of that, I have here and am displaying to my colleagues,

Mr. Speaker, Article 15-6, investigation of the 800th Military Police

Brigade. This was the report that was requested on January 19, 2004,

subsequent to the

Provost Marshal's investigation and report, which indicated severe

difficulties, tensions between military intelligence-gathering and

proper prison conduct by those in charge of the prisons, indicating

that there were training problems, operational problems that needed to

be addressed. And so on January 19, Lieutenant General Sanchez,

Lieutenant General Sanchez, the commander of the Combined Joint Task

Force 7, requested that the U.S. Central Command appoint an

investigating officer, and that investigating officer, of course, was

General Taguba. His report responded to the admonitions of Lieutenant

General Sanchez that an investigation of detention and internment

operations be undertaken, starting from November of 2003. November of

2003 is when the report went in, indicating that there had to be steps

taken to address these questions.

Let me quote from the opening paragraph. ``Lieutenant General Sanchez

cited recent reports of detainee abuse, escapes from confinement

facilities, and accountability lapses, which indicated systemic

problems within the brigade and suggested a lack of clear standards,

proficiency, and leadership.''

Fifty-three pages later, and if the gentleman will grant now, I will

not cite over and over again what is taking place in here, but one

shocking event after another.

This 53-page report, and this comes from CQ Today, Congressional

Quarterly Today by Neil Soros from the CQ staff, and he quotes, ``The

53-page report drafted by Army General Antonio Taguba, and based on an

investigation into the abuse allegations,'' that is this report that I

hold in my hand, ``that began in January was finished in April. The

report was detailed in this week's New Yorker magazine. At a Pentagon

news conference today, Secretary Rumsfeld defended the time it takes to

release such information.''

Now, this information was available from November of last year.

Quote: ``I recognize the appetite of people for instant information

and instant conclusions,'' he said. That is to say Secretary Rumsfeld.

``These things are complicated. They take some time. It required

interviewing people back in the States who had already left Iraq that

required discussions with people. They are proceeding in a very

systematic and appropriate way, and to the extent I conclude at any

time there is some slice of it that has not been investigated, has not

been looked at properly, you can be sure I will undertake such an

investigation.''

Clearly, the Secretary of Defense is dissembling and somehow thinks

that everybody in this country can be fooled as to what his

responsibility is. The Secretary of Defense has known, at least since

November of last year, what was going on and did not even inform the

President of the United States, because the Secretary of Defense, as I

said last night, apparently has assumed that he is the chief operating

officer of this country and that he does not need to inform the

Congress, he does not only not need to inform the Congress, but does

not even need to inform the President of the United States.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would just yield on

that point, yes, somebody has lost their job: the people who published

the pictures of the coffins coming home.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you who has been notified. I

can tell you who has been held responsible.

The New York Times, perhaps the same article, indicated yesterday,

the senior American commander in Iraq has ordered the first punishments

in the abuse of prisoners by American soldiers there, issuing severe

reprimand to six who served in supervisory positions and milder levels

of admonishment to a seventh. Those in supervisory positions received a

reprimand or a letter of admonishment. However, six subordinates

accused of carrying out the abuse already face criminal charges.

A moment longer.

`` `They did not know or participate in any crimes,' a senior

American officer in Baghdad said of the officers who received the

reprimand.'' Who determined that they did not know or participate in

any crimes? A senior American officer unnamed says in Baghdad, but they

know that the six subordinates, the poor grunts on the ground, they

know that they have got to face criminal charges. In addition, issued

the reprimand. Their responsibility is to set the standards in the

organization. They should have known, but they did not. So they just

get a reprimand.

They are the ones setting the standards in the organization by the

administration of senior officers in Baghdad. We already know what is

happening. The grunts on the ground are taking the fall. That is what

is happening. That is the reality. And the officers are running and

hiding, and they are being allowed to do it despite the fact that we

know that reports existed as far back as last November pointing out

what the difficulties and challenges were.

If the gentleman would yield on that point, would

the gentleman from Massachusetts kindly read back to us the last

sentence that he just read from that report with respect to the client.

I believe there was a sentence that the contractors were making

reference to who their client was. Could the gentleman read that

sentence.

The client.

If the gentleman will yield back, yes, the client

that is referred to presumably is the Department of Defense.

I have before me a letter that was received by the ranking member of

the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr.

Skelton) yesterday on May 4, from the Secretary of Defense, Mr.

Rumsfeld, where he states with respect to private security companies,

known as PSCs, private security companies, where he states, It is my

understanding that most of the PSCs doing business in Iraq do not work

directly for the U.S. government.

I am about to tell you. I am about to tell you.

They work under subcontracts to prime contractors to provide for the

protection of their employees. They are apparently just manifesting

themselves like spontaneous combustion or immaculate conceptions in

Iraq.

Many PSCs, and I am quoting the Secretary of Defense here, many PSCs

are hired by other entities such as Iraqi companies or private foreign

companies seeking business opportunities in Iraq.

We are in the middle of a war zone and the Secretary of Defense says,

well, 10- or 20,000 people over here with guns and going anyplace they

please and causing anything to happen that they want, what does it have

to do with me and my 135,000 people?

The CPA, the Coalition Provisional Authority, has established a PSC

working group to provide a forum, a forum, a discussion group, in which

PSCs exchange information, and approximately 50 PSCs are actively

involved in this group. He has a list of 60 that is attached to this.

Apparently 10 of them do not even bother to show up at the forum. God

knows what kind of rules they are operating under.

The Secretary goes on to say, The Department of Defense is drafting

uniform guidance regarding PSCs employed in Iraq under contracts using

U.S. appropriations, which means as of May 4, 2004, there is no uniform

guidance from the Department of Defense regarding the utilization of

private contractors being paid from U.S. appropriations.

This is dereliction of duty. How is it possible for the Secretary of

Defense to tell the American people and tell the American Congress that

he has no rules whatsoever and is in the process of forming what he

calls uniform guidance, whatever the hell that is? That is what the

Secretary of Defense has done. He has undermined completely the

policies of this country, has failed his President, failed this

Congress and failed his duty.

Mr. Speaker, it was just about a year ago, just

about this time that the first congressional delegation under the

leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. Hunter) went into

Baghdad from the Baghdad Airport up Kirkuk, the first opportunity that

Members of Congress had to actually meet face to face in Baghdad itself

with General Garner and Ambassador Bremer. We got into Baghdad the same

day, or within 24 hours or so of the time Ambassador Bremer was

replacing or complementing the service of General Garner.

I can tell the gentleman because I believe it was the gentleman from

Washington (Mr. Inslee) who mentioned that General Garner had some

ideas about what needed to be done vis-a-vis reconstruction. I can

affirm to the gentleman based on his suggestion which he just made

about elections that General Garner felt very strongly at that time

that councils of one kind and another should be allowed to be set up,

that we could go to the Iraqi people and trust that they would put

these together with a minimum of structure, if you will, from the

United States. That is to say we could help provide the logistical

capacity to help conduct the elections, but he felt they should move

forward expeditiously.

And I can tell you his suggestions were made in a context in which he

was shoved laterally just about as fast as he could go. I think we are

going to find General Garner, who was kind of dismissed as someone who

did not quite understand what was going on, from the point of view of

history will be shown as having a clear idea of what needed to be done.

He was rebuked publicly.

Mr. Speaker, the indication today was from the

Department of Defense that Reservists and National Guard can look

forward to 16,000 more being called up in the next year to supplement

those already in service.