would hardly think they were talking about the same subject. It is a whitewash. It is a blatant disregard for the American people and an insult to every person of color. This was a study we commissioned to find out about the health disparities between groups in this country. Congress asked for science, and the administration's spin doctors buried it. They hid it from view and substituted their own version of the country.

In the June original document, the Department's scientists found ''significant inequality'' in health care. The last one, the doctored one, became ''national problems.'' The scientists emphasized that these disparities are ''pervasive in our health care system.'' The whitewash omitted those conclusions. Text describing data tables inside the paper was altered. In the key findings section, the whitewash omitted 28 of the 30 references to disparity. Everything was done to hide the real facts from people of color, from every citizen in America.

What does the administration say tonight to people of color? What does this administration say tonight to every American? Somebody ordered this whitewash. The American people need to know who did it. I would think there ought to be an investigation to find out who was responsible and take appropriate action. We cannot allow someone to hide the truth from Americans, no matter who they are. We cannot permit someone to deceive Members of Congress and every American. We cannot tolerate someone who alters a report that directly affects people of color and their health status in this country.

Someone is trying to trick us into thinking that the administration has all the answers and that everything is hunky-dory. This is one more evidence for the fact that this administration will not tell the truth, whether it is about weapons of mass destruction or about al Qaeda connections or even down to a health report. They will not even tell us what happens in communities of color with respect to diabetes, with respect to high blood pressure.

They said about Native Americans, Native Americans have a lower cancer rate. That sounds good. But not one single mention of the fact that they have the lowest life expectancy and the highest infant mortality rate among all Americans. How can they put a report out like that and let people believe that everything is equal in this country? It is not. We have not paid attention. When we put more money into national health institutes, and I agree with that, we ought to use science as the basis on which we allocate the money for the problems that affect the most people.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to ask the President to find out who did this in his administration. It is a travesty.

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

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. HOEFFEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WAS AMERICA AT WAR IN THE 1990S?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight by my colleague from Georgia. What we would like to talk about tonight is the issue of whether America is at war. Were we at war in the 1990s? What was the reaction of the administration in the 1990s? What do we see in the year 2000 and beyond? And what have we found about the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq?

First, were we a country at war during the 1990s? We have all the examples of the attacks on the United States. In 1993, the World Trade Center was bombed. In 1996, our military barracks were bombed in Saudi Arabia. Our embassies were attacked in Africa. The USS *Cole* was attacked in 2000. In 1995, two unidentified gunmen killed two U.S. diplomats and wounded a third in Karachi. A Palestinian sniper opened fire on tourists atop the Empire State Building. In 2000, a bomb exploded across the street from the U.S. embassy in Manila. It is not only the high-profile attacks that we should be concerned about, but what we saw during the 1990s was a pattern of attacks against the U.S., against our embassies, against our economic interests, against our military personnel, and against American civilians.

If we take a look at the quotes and the things that folks said about the 1990s and what was going on specifically, and maybe focused more on Iraq than anywhere else, you kind of get a feeling as to whether in the 1990s people in the administration understood the threat that terrorist groups and that Saddam Hussein posed to the United States.

The question that some ask today, or the facts that they state today is that, well, you know, this all came up after 2001, that the data was fabricated.

What did Bill Clinton say during his administration? February 17, 1998:

''Iraqi agents have undermined and undercut U.N. inspectors. They've harassed the inspectors, lied to them, disabled monitoring cameras, literally spirited evidence out of the back doors. And they will be all the more lethal if we allow them to build arsenals of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them. We simply cannot allow that to happen.''

Again continuing, President Clinton in 1998:

''There should be no doubt Saddam's ability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction poses a grave threat to the peace of that region and the security of the world. There is no more clear example of this threat than Saddam Hussein's Iraq. His regime threatens the safety of his people, the stability of his region and the security of all the rest of us. In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more the very kind of threat Iraq poses now, a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction ready to use them or provide them to terrorists who travel the world. If we fail to respond today, Saddam will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity. I have no doubt he would use them again if permitted to develop them.'' A clear case that on February 17, 1998, President Clinton was not only aware of the threats that Saddam Hussein and Iraq posed but that the threat extended to people like Saddam and to different terrorist organizations.

I do not know if my colleague from Georgia has any other quotes from President Clinton or not. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Yes, certainly I do. Here is one, and I quote, from President Clinton:

''Iraq repeatedly made false declarations about the weapons that it had left in its possession after the Gulf War. When UNSCOM would then uncover evidence that gave a lie to those declarations, Iraq would simply amend the reports.''

Another quote, again from President Clinton:

''And someday, some way, I guarantee you he'll use the arsenal, and I think every one of you who has really worked on this for any length of time believes that, too.''

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reclaiming my time, in comments by President Bill Clinton at the meeting of the National Security Council, comments on the bombing of strategic interests in Iraq: ''I am convinced the decision I made to order this military action, though difficult, was absolutely the right thing to do. It is in our interest and in the interest of people around the world. Saddam has used weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles before. I have no doubt he would use them again if permitted to develop them.''

I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Here are another couple of quotes. Again, President Clinton:

''We want to seriously reduce his capacity to threaten his neighbors.''

President Clinton again:

''We have learned through harsh experience that the only answer to aggression and illegal behavior is firmness, determination and, when necessary, action.''

Mr. HOEKSTRA. There is no doubt that in the 1990s the Clinton administration, or at least the President, voiced the concerns about terrorist organizations, Iraq and specifically Saddam Hussein; but it was not only the President. The Vice President, May 23, 2000, during a conference breakfast with the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee:

''Despite our swift victory and our efforts since, there is no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein still seeks to amass weapons of mass destruction. You know as well as I do that as long as Saddam Hussein stays in power, there can be no comprehensive peace for the people of Israel or the people of the Middle East. We have made it clear that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein gone.''

Al Gore, May 23, 2000: ''We have made it clear that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein gone.''

Mr. GINGREY. Just listen to former, actually Senator Gore at the time and former Vice President Gore in a speech, a major policy speech made on September 29, 1992 by then Senator Al Gore, and I quote:

''He, Saddam, had already launched poison gas attacks repeatedly and Bush''—referring to Bush I—''looked the other way.''

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, this is the Vice President, or at that point in time the Senator?

Mr. GINGREY. The Senator running for Vice President.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Referring to Bush I, and, what, accusing him of inaction?

Mr. GINGREY. Absolutely.

I will finish that quote:

''He, Saddam, had already conducted extensive terrorism activities and Bush looked the other way. He was already deeply involved in the effort to acquire nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and he, President Bush, looked the other way.

''Well, in my view the Bush administration was acting in a manner directly opposite to what you would expect with all of the evidence that it had available at the time. Saddam Hussein's nature and intentions were perfectly visible.'' Again, a major policy speech made by then Senator and Vice Presidential candidate Al Gore, September 29, 1992.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We go on through the administration. Remarks by Madeleine Albright, the Secretary of State:

''In this struggle our adversaries are likely to avoid traditional battlefield situations because there American dominance is well established. We must be concerned instead by weapons of mass destruction and by the cowardly instruments of sabotage and hidden bombs. These unconventional threats endanger not only our Armed Forces but all Americans and America's friends everywhere.''

Madeleine Albright in the Clinton administration got much of this right in perceiving the threat, as was so brutally proved on September 11.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman will yield, continuing on, then Secretary of State Madeleine Albright as quoted in the Chicago Tribune, November 16, 1997: ''Hussein's weapons will not discriminate if and when they are used, and therefore it is important for the region to understand that he is a threat.''

□ 1800

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk a little bit more about some of these quotes, and then we will talk about exactly what the Clinton administration did in the 1990s as they laid out the threat from terrorist organizations, as they laid out the threat from Saddam and Iraq.

Madeleine Albright, subject: Tonight's air strikes against strategic targets in Iraq. ''This is a moment of grave determination. We have decided to use force because other means simply have not worked. Saddam's capacity to develop and brandish such armaments poses a threat to international security and peace that cannot be ignored. Month after month we have given Iraq chance after chance to move from confrontation to cooperation. We have explored and exhausted every diplomatic action. We will see whether force can persuade Iraq's misguided leaders to reverse course and to accept at long last the need to abide by the rule of law and the will of the world.''

It took 3 years before inspectors on a limited basis were ever allowed back.

I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be informative to people who are paying attention, and I think all Americans are paying attention and they are listening to a lot of political rhetoric during this Presidential election year and the criticism that they are hearing not only from the leaders of our military, from the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, but especially to the Secretary of Defense, the honorable Donald Rumsfeld.

Listen to what former Secretary of Defense William Cohen had to say: ''Noted again Tuesday that in the past Iraq imported enough material to produce up to 200 tons of the deadly chemical agent VX, 'theoretically enough to kill every man, woman, and child' on earth. Finding and eliminating all such chemical and biological warfare stocks must be an international priority.'' L.A. Times, November 26, 1997, Secretary of Defense William Cohen under the Clinton administration.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, he goes on in another talk with an interview with Katie Couric on December 18. ''One of reasons we are taking this action,'' and this is the Secretary of Defense, ''is we don't want to see it taken with chemical or biological agents, but we do know,'' not we estimate, we think, ''but we do know that Iraq has been in process of building that kind of capability. But we're looking at the intelligence very closely. We anticipate there will be terrorist attacks in a variety of areas of the globe, and we are taking whatever precautions we can against it.''

Remember those words, because we will get back to it in a few minutes. ''We are taking whatever precautions we can against it.''

And what is against it? The variety of terrorist attacks in all areas of the globe.

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, this next quote from former President Bill Clinton, I think, really speaks to it as much as any that we have given tonight, and here is the quote: ''In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more the very kind of threat Iraq poses now, a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists, drug traffickers, or organized criminals who travel the world among us unnoticed. If we fail to respond today, Saddam, and all those who would follow in his footsteps, will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity, even in the face of a clear message from the United Nations Security Council and clear evidence of a weapons of mass destruction program.''

And what was done then, Mr. Speaker? It was just drawing lines in the sand and then another line in the sand and another line in the sand and a dare and a double dare and a double-dog dare, and nothing was happening to deal with this until, of course, we had to strike the strike on 9/11 that resulted in over 3,000 lives lost.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, here we go on and we go back to President Clinton on February 17, 1998, talking about the kind of environment that we see in Iraq and the kind of folks that we are trying to work on and taking a look at denial and deception. But how did Iraq work? This is President Clinton's description in 1998:

''Iraq repeatedly made false declarations about the weapons that it had left in its possession after the Gulf War. When UNSCOM,'' that is, the UN inspectors, ''would then uncover evidence that gave lie to those declarations, Iraq would simply amend the reports.

''Iraqi agents have undermined and undercut UNSCOM. They've harassed the inspectors, lied to them, disabled monitoring cameras, literally spirited evidence out of the back doors of suspect facilities as inspectors walked through the front door. And our people were there observing it and had the pictures to prove it.

''If he refuses or continues to evade his obligations through more tactics of

delay and deception, he and he alone will be to blame for the consequences.''

September 9: ''We've pushed and pushed some more to help UNSCOM,'' this is Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, ''break through the smokescreen of lies and diction put out by the Iraqi regime . . . ''

''. . . UNSCOM was able for the first time to conduct inspections of sensitive sites where it found new evidence that Iraq had lied about the size of its chemical weapons stock.''

These are really interesting quotes, considering the debate. We have gone into this war situation with a number of allies, but the President has been critiqued because there were not enough partners in the process.

Here is what President Clinton said in a debate with Robert Dole on October 6, 1996: ''Sometimes the U.S. has to act alone, or at least has to act first. Sometimes we cannot let other countries have a veto on our foreign policy.''

Madeleine Albright's quote in 1998: ''I am going to explain our position. And while we always prefer to act multilaterally, we are prepared to go unilaterally.''

President Clinton, Time Magazine, 1998: ''Would the Iraqi people be better off if there was a change in leadership? I certainly think they would be.'' Remember, by the year 2000, the official policy of the United States was regime change in Iraq.

1998, President Clinton: ''If we fail to respond today, Hussein, and all those who would follow in his footsteps,'' and I think the President was referencing terrorist organizations that would attack America and other freedom-loving people around the world, ''and all those who would follow in his footsteps, will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity.'' This is President Clinton.

And ''what if he fails to comply and we fail to act? . . . Some day, some way, I guarantee you, he'll use the arsenal.'' President Clinton, August 31, 1998.

What we are seeing throughout the 1990s, whether it is President Clinton, whether it is the Vice President, whether it is the Secretary of State, or whether it is the Secretary of Defense, there is a clear pattern that the Clinton administration, rightfully so, identified terrorist threats, Saddam Hussein, and Iraq as a threat to the people of Iraq, as a threat to Israel, as a threat to the stability of the Middle East, and as a threat to the United States and the rest of the world.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, continuing on the line of reason the gentleman from Michigan is presenting, again Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in 1998, in fact, November 23, and this was in Time Magazine: ''Up to now we've had diplomacy backed by force. Now we need to shift to force backed by diplomacy.''

And listen to what she says less than a month later: ''Month after month we have given Iraq chance after chance to move from confrontation to cooperation, and we have explored and exhausted every diplomatic action. We will see now whether force can persuade Iraq's misguided leaders to reverse course and to accept at long last the need to abide by the rule of law and the will of the world.''

These were remarks made by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright on the night of the air strikes, the very limited air strikes, against strategic targets in Iraq, her comments made December 16, 1998.

What happened over the next 2 years? Nothing. These limited air strikes did nothing, and Saddam continued with his weapons of mass destruction, his terrorism on his own people, his refusal to let the weapons inspectors come back into the country and make sure he was complying with the U.N. resolutions.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, there are those who say that this administration was the first to try to create a link between al Qaeda and Iraq. That is absolutely wrong.

In 1998, again with the attack on the plant in Sudan: ''U.S. officials who declined to be identified told reporters that there were contacts as the Sudanese company was being developed between Al Shifa officials and Iraqis working on their country's VX program. 'Iraq is the only country we are aware of that had planned to use WMD,' the officials said. The officials also said there is evidence linking Osama bin Laden. Defense Secretary Cohen has publicly stated that bin Laden had some financial interest in contributing to this particular facility in Khartoum.''

Where is that? How do we know if Secretary of Defense William Cohen said that? ''We know that he, bin Laden, had contributed to this particular facility,'' Secretary of Defense William Cohen, New York Times, August 29, 1998.

Another quote: ''And indeed we have information that Iraq has assisted in the chemical weapons activity in Sudan.'' That is an op-ed by Samuel Berger, the national security advisor, the Washington Times, October 16, 1998.

He goes on in that activity: ''And, indeed, we have information that Iraq has assisted in the chemical weapons activity in Sudan . . . We had information linking bin Laden to the Sudanese regime and the Al Shifa plant.'' National security advisor, Samuel Berger, op-ed, October 16 in the Washington Times.

It is interesting. This link between Saddam Hussein, Iraq, terrorist organizations, and the threat that they combine to depose the United States and the rest of the world is not new. It has been outlined through the 1990s.

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will allow me, I would just like to shift a little bit now and talk about the testimony and put it in the right, proper context that we are hearing from David Kay.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, let us not go there yet, all right? Because every year there is something that is put out. It is called the Report on Global Terrorism. And if my colleague will take a look, he has got the 1999 review of Iraq. I have got the 1998.

□ 1815

Here is what it says in 1998. The global terrorism overview of state-sponsored terrorism. Iraq continues to provide safe haven to a variety of Palestinian rejectionist groups, including the Abu Nidal Organization, the Arab Liberation Front, and the former head of the now defunct 15 May Organization, Abu Ibrahim, who masterminded several bombings of U.S. aircraft.

In December, press reports indicated that Abu Nidal had relocated to Iraq and may be receiving medical treatment. Abu Nidal's move to Baghdad would increase the prospect that Saddam may call on the ANO to conduct anti-U.S. attacks.

Iraq also provides bases, weapons and protection to the MEK, a terrorist group that opposes the current Iranian regime. Back in 1998, through much of the 1990s, it was clear, at least in the global terrorism overview of state-sponsored terrorism, Iraq has consistently been identified as a state sponsor of terrorism on a global basis.

What did the report say in 1999?

I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Well, Iraq continued to plan and sponsor international terrorism in 1999. Although Baghdad focused primarily on the anti-regime opposition, both at home and abroad, it continued to provide safe haven and to support various terrorist groups.

Many press reports stated that according to a defecting Iraqi intelligence agent, the Iraqi Intelligence Service had planned to bomb the offices of Radio Free Europe in Prague. Radio Free Europe offices include Radio Liberty, which began broadcasting news and information to Iraq in October of 1998. The plot was foiled when it became public in early 1999.

The Iraq opposition publicly stated its fears that the Baghdad regime was planning to assassinate those opposed to Saddam Hussein. A spokesman for the Iraqi National Accord in November said that the movement security organs had obtained information about a plan to assassinate its secretary general, Dr. Allawi, and a member of the movement's political bureau, as well as other Iraqi leaders.

Iraq continued to provide safe haven to a variety of Palestinian rejectionist groups, including the Abu Nidal Organization; the Arab Liberation Front, ALF; and the former head of the now defunct 15 May Organization, Abu Ibrahim, who masterminded several bombings of United States aircraft.

Iraq provided bases, weapons and protection to the MEK, an Iranian terrorist group that opposes the current

Iranian regime. In 1999, MEK cadre based in Iraq assassinated or attempted to assassinate several high-ranking Iranian government officials, including Brigadier General Ali Sayyad Shirazi, deputy chief of Iran's Joint Staff, who was actually killed in an assassination attack.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If I now take a look at the report on global terrorism in 2001, what does it say?

In addition, the regime continued to provide training and political encouragement to numerous terrorist groups, although its main focus was on dissident Iraqi activity overseas. But Iraq provided bases to several terrorist groups, including the Mujahedin-e-Khalq, the MEK, the Kurdistan Worker's Party, the Palestine Liberation Front, the Abu Nidal Organization.

In 2001, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the PFLP, raised its profile in the West Bank and Gaza Strip by carrying out successful terrorist attacks against Israeli targets. In recognition of the PFLP's growing role, an Iraqi vice president met with the former PFLP secretary, General Habbash, in Baghdad. In January 2001, there was continued Iraqi support for the intifadah. Also in mid-September, a senior delegation from the PFLP met with an Iraqi deputy prime minister. Baghdad also continued to host other Palestinian rejectionist groups, including the Arab Liberation Front and the 15 May Organization. There is no doubt that Iraq continued its connection with terrorist organizations.

What happened in 2002? I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Well, Iraq planned and sponsored international terrorism in 2002, that is what they did. Throughout the year, the Iraqi Intelligence Service, IIS, laid the groundwork for possible attacks against both civilian and military targets in the United States and other Western countries. The IIS reportedly instructed its agents in early 2001 that their main mission was to obtain information about United States and Israeli targets. The IIS also threatened dissidents in the Near East and Europe and stole records and computer files detailing anti-regime activity.

In December of 2002, the press claimed Iraq intelligence killed Walid Ibrahim Abbas al-Muhah al-Mayahi, a Shi'ite Iraqi refugee who was living in Lebanon and a member of the Iraqi National Congress. Iraq was a safe haven, a transit point and an operational base for groups and individuals who direct violence against the United States, Israel and other countries.

Baghdad overtly assisted two categories of Iraqi-based terrorist organizations, Iranian dissidents devoted to toppling the Iranian Government and a variety of Palestinian groups opposed to peace with Israel. The groups include the Iranian Mujahedeen-e-Khalq and the Abu Nidal Organization, although Iraq reportedly killed its leader.

The Palestinian Liberation Front, PLF, and the Arab Liberation Front, ALF. In the past year, the PLF increased its operational activities against Israel and sent its members to Iraq for training for future terrorist attacks.

Baghdad provided material assistance to other Palestinian terrorist groups that are in the forefront of this intifadah. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine General Command, Hamas, and the Palestine Islamic Jihad are the three most important groups to which Baghdad has extended outreach and support efforts. Saddam paid the families of Palestinian suicide bombers to encourage Palestinian terrorism, channeling $25,000 since March through the ALF alone to families of suicide bombers, both in Gaza and on the West Bank. Public testimonials by Palestinian civilians and officials and cancelled checks captured by Israel in the West Bank verify the transfer of a considerable amount of Iraqi money.

The presence of several hundred al Qaeda operatives fighting with the small Kurdish Islamist group Ansar al Islam in the northeastern corner of Iraqi Kurdistan where the IIS operates is well documented. Iraq has an agent in the most senior levels of Ansar al Islam as well.

In addition, small numbers of highly placed al Qaeda militants were present in Baghdad and areas of Iraq that Saddam controls. It is inconceivable that these groups were in Iraq without the knowledge and acquiescence of Saddam's regime.

In the past year, al Qaeda operatives in Northern Iraq concocted suspect chemicals under the direction of senior al Qaeda associate Abu Mussab Zarqawi; and they tried to smuggle them into Russia, Western Europe, and the United States for terrorist organizations and operations. Iraq is a party to five of the 12 international conventions and protocols relating to terrorism.

That is what Iraq has been doing in the year 2002.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think the record is relatively clear. In many ways, the Clinton administration in the 1990s got the message. After the World Trade Center bombing, after the U.S. barracks bombings, after our embassy bombings, after the USS *Cole* and as American civilians were attacked around the world, the rhetoric was very, very good.

The rhetoric that came out of the Clinton administration said we are at war. We are prepared to punish and hold those accountable who have attacked us. We are willing to go in and preemptively attack and be on the offense against those who may attack us in the future; and we may even go it alone, because we will not allow another country to hold veto over American national security.

They defined the war. They said we are at risk at home and abroad. Civilian, military individuals would be at risk; our allies would be at risk. Madeleine Albright identified that it would be an unconventional war. Parts of it would be conventional; parts of it would be unconventional. Some battles would be in the open; some would be in secret. We would use both conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction. It is a violent and a dangerous world. Truck bombs, improvised explosive devices, small labs for chemical and biological weapons, weapons that could be delivered by plane, ships, missiles, or backpacks.

You go back to the one quote I think you had from, I am not sure if it was the President or Al Gore, but I got the quotes here again.

From William Cohen: ''We anticipate there will be terrorist attacks in a variety of areas of the globe and we are taking whatever precautions we can against it.''

Al Gore in 2000: ''We have made it clear that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein gone.''

I am not sure what quote my colleague has over there, but we ought to take a look at what the Clinton administration did in the 1990s.

Mr. GINGREY. I think what the gentleman so clearly pointed out is the previous administration made the case against Saddam Hussein. They made the case based on the intelligence that they were receiving at that time. What they did is they talked the talk, and we have spent some time here this evening giving you some quotes, various members, including the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is a consistent message through all levels of their policy chain.

Mr. GINGREY. Absolutely. The point I was going to make is they were willing, the previous administration, to talk the talk; but what they were not willing to do was to walk the walk.

This administration has walked the walk; and because of that, this world is a safer place with the capture of Saddam Hussein.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. There is an interesting article I would like to reference that talks a little bit about what the previous administration did during the 1990s. The article is ''Show Stoppers,'' and it is out of the Weekly Standard, January 26, 2004. It is written by Richard Shultz, who is director of International Security Studies at the Fletcher school, Tufts University, and director of research at the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence in Washington, D.C.

He brings up an interesting point. America has the best trained military in the world, regular Army; but then we also have some very special folks, Special Operations folks.

Remember, the policy as he lays out here was that we were prepared to preemptively and offensively attack those individuals who we thought might be a threat to the United States. We knew

who they were. The Clinton administration identified al Qaeda; they identified bin Laden as being threats. We heard that in our quotes tonight.

But what Richard Shultz goes on to point out, he says not once during the 1990s, even though we on occasion might have known where bin Laden was, we knew where his terrorist camps were, not once did we take and use our Special Operations forces to neutralize the capability of these folks who we were relatively confident and who the Clinton administration were selling the American people on that these were a threat to the American public and to our military and to our allies around the world.

We never used our Delta Force, we never used our Seals, we never used our Rangers to kill or capture bin Laden or attack al Qaeda training bases.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman will yield further, one of the most preposterous facts is that during of the previous administration in the late 1990s, Osama bin Laden was offered up to our country, and we refused to accept him saying that he was not that much of a threat. We did not need him.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Taking back my time, Mr. Shultz goes on to talk about the Clinton administration's desire for preemptive and offensive actions. But they never took the step. Terrorism is a crime, they said. They said we will prosecute it afterwards. We will not use our forces for minimizing the capability of these people to wage war against us. It does not meet the Pentagon's definition of war. We are risk-averse.

That sent a very clear message to terrorist organizations and rogue regimes like Iran, Iraq, Syria and a number of other countries that said the United States is not going to do anything.

□ 1830

They may respond, but even if we attack their battle ships, even if we attack their embassies or their barracks, they will not respond or they will respond in a very minimal way, and they will allow us to keep moving forward and to prepare other attacks.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. No question, when we keep drawing lines in the sand and making threats and dares and double dares, as was done by the previous administration, attack after attack after attack, the other side is rightly going to assume that you are just so much bluster, that you are no threat. So they continue in their terroristic ways, and that really is essentially what has happened. Thank God that this President, our 43rd President, George W. Bush, had the courage to finally say, enough is enough.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, a couple of other things. We never used our Special Operations forces. But with all of this discussion about what capabilities do we have in intelligence, it is helpful to have a discussion as to what the Clinton administration did during the 1990s with intelligence. From 1992 to 1999, the intelligence agency, we decreased the number of agents we had in the field by 27 percent, we decreased the number of stations or locations that we had around the world by 30 percent, and we decreased the number of assets. What is an asset? An asset is a spy. We reduced the number of assets we had by 40 percent. We gutted our human intelligence capability. We have phenomenal satellites and different things that can do wonderful things in trying to help us figure out what is going on, but unless we have the human intelligence to determine intent and planning or to go inside of a building and see what is going on inside of a building and to hear and be part of the discussions, we cannot figure out exactly what is going on; and even if we have those people in certain places, it is still difficult to pull together the entire practice.

But the reason we were kind of blind in Iraq in 2000 is that Bill Clinton's administration, President Clinton's administration, gutted our human intelligence. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY. Well, no question. And of course it reminds me, thinking back, of I think it was the Clinton administration had decided that they wanted to have a nicer, a nicer, kinder, gentler intelligence agency; and anybody that was ever known to have jaywalked or spit on the sidewalk, they were not eligible to be an intelligence officer because they did not project that image.

I am going to tell my colleagues right now, it is clear that when the going gets tough, the tough get going; and we need tough people. And as the gentleman from Michigan was saying, we cut down on the number of personnel involved in intelligence operations and the kind of people that we need to deal with these people on an international basis. This is dangerous work, and we need tough, dangerous people to fight fire with fire. We did not have that in the previous administration.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what my colleague is talking about is that in 1995 and 1996 the Clinton administration implemented what was called the Deutsch Doctrine. John Deutsch was the director of the CIA. And, after some things happened in 1995, the Deutsch Doctrine becomes the official policy of the CIA.

What does the Deutsch Doctrine say? It does what my colleague said, although maybe not quite as strict as what my colleague said; but it said, we are not going to recruit as human assets those individuals who have human rights records or who have criminal records; we are not going to recruit those kinds of people to spy for the United States. As a matter of fact, we are not only going to not recruit those people in the future, we are going to go and do what is called the ''Deutsch scrub.'' We are going to go back and take a look at those people who are working for us today. They have made that choice, they have left the dark side, they are spying for the United States, they are giving us the information that we need to be safe, but the Clinton administration says, thanks, but no thanks. You have a dark record in your background, you are out of here, leaving these people in no man's land and saying, well, let me see. I was a bad guy, I came over to the good side, and now you are cutting me loose.

It was a chilling effect for the work of the CIA and the people that were doing the work in the CIA. It was a chilling effect, obviously, for those spies who were spying for us and now were cut off; and the basic message was, you are not good people to do business with. They think, one day you are going to use us, and the next day we are out in the cold.

We get to 2000. And I wonder how many people in Saddam's cabinet room, when we watch him sitting at the table, I wonder how many of them had clean human rights records. I mean, remember, they hung thousands of people in their jails. There is evidence they might have used chemical or biological testing on some of their prisoners. They killed over 300,000 of their own people. They gassed the Kurds, they gassed the Iranians. Sitting in that room, I do not think there were a lot of Eagle Scouts. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that I am sure there were no Eagle Scouts. When we are dealing with an international terrorist, a brutal, rogue dictator like Saddam Hussein and the terrorists associated with him, the only thing they understand is an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. And it is like our military leaders have said many times in testifying before Congress, before committees, before the Committee on Armed Services, if the die-hards insist, they are going to die hard, and we have given it to them. I commend the President for that, and I think this world is a safer place because of it. It is not over, and we do not need to be thinking about an exit strategy until it is over. Our men and women deserve better than that. Many of them have paid the ultimate sacrifice, and they deserve a victory, and we shall have a victory.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, candidate Governor Bush in 1999, he echoed the understanding of the threat that President Clinton, Vice President Gore, and others laid out. He called to mind an earlier time when free people were confronted with what he called rapid change and momentous choices. In was the 1930s, Nazi Germany is rearming, the British are reluctant to respond. Winston Churchill outlines to the people, the United Kingdom, what they are facing. Winston Churchill: ''The era of procrastination, of half measures, of soothing and baffling expedience, of delays is coming to a

close. In its place, we are entering a period of consequences.''

For the United States, that day of consequences, the day where we suffered the consequences of half measures, of soothing and baffling expedience, of delays through the 1990s, we suffered that day of consequence on 9–11, 2001.

We want to move on a little bit and talk a little bit about what Dr. Kay has found relative to what the National Intelligence Estimate indicated we might find, and this is the backdrop of what President Clinton outlined during the 1990s and the Clinton administration outlined during the 1990s about the dangers of Saddam Hussein and Iraq. It is in the backdrop of what happened on 9–11, 2001; and the National Intelligence Estimate indicated that since inspections ended in 1998, Iraq has maintained its chemical and biological weapons effort. What has Dr. Kay found? This is from a statement by Dr. Kay on the ''Interim Progress Report.'' He talks about discovering dozens of WMD-related program activities. Concealment efforts. So it is very, very public that Dr. Kay has recognized and found that the National Intelligence Estimate said Iraq has maintained its chemical and biological weapons effort programs. I did not say weapons; I said programs. It is exactly what Dr. Kay found when he got to Iraq.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, in regard to that, I just wanted to point out, and I started to mention this a little bit earlier, that Dr. Kay was a consultant to the Iraqi Survey Group. The Iraqi Survey Group is 1,300 individuals in Iraq continuing, as we speak tonight, continuing to look for weapons of mass destruction. The Iraqi Survey Group is not led by consultant Dr. David Kay; the Iraqi Survey Group is commanded by Lieutenant General Keith Dayton. Dr. Kay worked for General Dayton as a consultant, and General Dayton told a group of us when we were in Iraq over the Christmas season that Dr. Kay had been out of Iraq for over a month, and I do not think that Dr. Kay has been back in Iraq since that time.

So it is very possible that he does not actually know what the Iraqi Survey Group is doing and what they are finding right now. I will tell my colleagues one thing that they are finding. We talk about weapons of mass destruction. If we want to very narrowly define that as chemical weapons or nerve gas or biological anthrax, that is one definition of weapons of mass destruction.

But I am going to tell my colleagues, the ultimate weapon of mass destruction was found in Iraq; and he was in a little hole just south of Tikrit, and we got rid of him. And in the process of looking for these other weapons of mass destruction, what have we found? Hundreds, literally hundreds of mass graves with thousands, hundreds of thousands of people, his own people that Saddam had gassed, and also untold numbers of caches of weapons of conventional destruction. My colleagues tell me one of these road-side devices is not a weapon of mass destruction or a shoulder-mounted SA–7 rocket from Russia or a grenade launcher? Absolutely. We are finding and destroying as we continue to seek, and I truly believe that we will find those chemical and biological weapons.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the National Intelligence Estimate said, if left unchecked, Iraq probably will have a nuclear weapon during this decade.

Here is what Dr. Kay had to say, George Stephanopoulos, October 5, 2003: ''I think if they had, if someone had given them the enriched material or the plutonium, I think that it would have taken them a year or less to fabricate a weapon from that material. They had the capability, they had the knowledge, once given the proper material to very quickly develop a nuclear weapon.''

I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, this is a comment, speaking of Dr. Kay's report, here is what Dr. Kay says, among many things that Dr. Kay is saying. There is something to link them, Saddam, to weapons of mass destruction, and that is the equipment. The equipment was on the prohibited list that had to be declared. The fact that they did not declare the equipment, not only did they not declare it, it was imported equipment. A lot of it we dated was imported from after 1998 in spite of U.N. sanctions.

He went on to say, another quote from Dr. Kay: ''We tend to, when we analyze a failure, look at our own failures and forget there is another side to the equation.''

Again, this is Dr. Kay: ''I am convinced the Iraqis tried to deceive us and, in part, they tried to deceive us and others into believing that they really did have those weapons.''

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, here we have NIE key judgments: In view of most agencies, Baghdad is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program.

Here is the interview, or here is his testimony in front of the Senate Committee on Armed Services last week or a week and a half ago. The NIE concluded that Iraq could build its first nuclear weapons when it acquires efficient weapons-grade material. Do you think that is accurate?

Kay: Yes. You have to realize that this was a country that had designed and gone through a decade-long nuclear program. They knew the secrets.

Mr. Speaker, much of the assessment that was done, the National Intelligence Estimate, was pretty accurate. Obviously, the expectation of finding stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction, I thought we would find them quicker. We have not found them. Dr. Kay believes that there is a high probability that they do not exist and we may not find them, but recognizes that he has talked about and he has seen the Iraqis' ability to gut, and they looted their information files and burned the records, destroyed the records.

□ 1845

They were great at denial and deception. They loved to bury things. Not only did Saddam Hussein go in a spider hole, but they took Mig-29s, pulled them out in the countryside, dug a hole, had the cockpit open and filled them with sand and dirt and buried them. There were things that were moved to Syria.

I think Dr. Kay with the interviews and things he has done has a very good assessment, but he will acknowledge that the search is not complete. That particular part he says is 85 percent complete, but there will always be a level of uncertainty because of how well the Iraqis did denial and deception.

Mr. GINGREY. He went on to say, and again this is part of the Dr. Kay's report, ''The surprising thing we have found in the biological program is a vast network of laboratories. It is now over two dozen labs that were not declared to the U.N. even though they had equipment and were clearly conducting activities that were declarable. Now, quite frankly, we are not sure fully what they were doing right now. They had biological and chemical production equipment in them. Most of them are relatively small by historic Iraqi standards. They are mostly in houses and residential areas. Some are in business establishments. One was in a hospital. These are facilities that at the minimum carried out research and development and kept the scientific skill level.''

When you think about the fact that it took us months and months to find Saddam in the country, a country the size of California, buried in a six-by-three-foot hole south of Tikrit, and probably would not have found him without accurate, absolutely, the most accurate human intelligence, I do not think it is surprising that we are having difficulty finding these weapons of mass destruction.

There are any number of things that he could have done with them, from shipping them out of the country, to destroying them, to burying them, to putting them in very small vials. It does not take a footlocker to store some of these weapons of mass destruction. They are easily hidden.

So we need to keep looking, absolutely. The Iraqi Survey Group under General Dayton will continue that search.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for joining me in this Special Order this evening. I think we firmly established that the record clearly outlines that, for the last decade and more, Iraq has been identified as a terrorist regime, dangerous to its neighbors, its own people and the rest of the world.

As a matter of fact, I think in one of the quotes that the gentleman went

through, then-Senator Al Gore attacked the previous Bush administration for not doing enough to rein in Saddam Hussein and Iraq. And this was a President who took them to war once and that was not enough. This was an administration that talked about attacking unilaterally.

The Clinton administration laid the foundation for the dangers of the Iraqi regime under Saddam Hussein. They did not respond. September 11 happened. It is a whole new world. The threat was outlined. The intelligence was there. The President responded. And the Iraqi people, as the gentleman and I have found out as we have gone over there, the Iraqi people are better off and are thankful that Saddam has been removed from power and that they can move and move forward in building a free and democratic Iraq.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 361) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 361

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, February 11, 2004, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. Tuesday, February 24, 2004, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Thursday, February 12, 2004, Friday, February 13, 2004, or Saturday, February 14, 2004, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, February 23, 2004, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE TO SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2004

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Saturday, February 14, 2004, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 361, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2004

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 25, 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. WAYNE T. GILCHREST TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION THROUGH FEBRUARY 24, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 11, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable WAYNE T. GILCHREST to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through February 24, 2004.

DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

WHAT ARE THEY THINKING?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to give voice to the voiceless. Millions of Americans are filling out unemployment forms and are filling our unemployment rolls. Many more are dropping off the lists because they simply see no hope and no prospects for jobs in the future.

According to recent reports, in the last 3 months, more than 40 percent of the unemployed have been out of work for more than 15 months, for over a year. We have not seen record numbers like this since 1983. Jobs are becoming scarcer.

In my own State of Ohio, we have lost 264,700 jobs since President Bush took office. And last week in our district, Dixie Cups, owned by Georgia Pacific, announced its closure; 207 more Americans will be without work. Nationwide, we have seen the disappearance of over 3 million private sector jobs. Now the Bush administration appears to be supporting outsourcing of even more of our jobs overseas.

It used to be that it was only the workers on the line who had to worry. Now, in Silicon Valley, the high-tech areas of the country have to worry, too; and in our medical community, if we are to read the President's report, even radiologists and those in medical tech are feeling the pain and will feel the pain.

We are not just talking about the manufacturers and the farmers anymore. Even the previously sacred service sector jobs are under threat. Even telephone solicitors are now being outsourced to India and to Ireland as the ranks of our unemployed continue to grow.

Earlier this week, the top Bush economic advisor, the head of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, stated, outsourcing of jobs is a form of free trade, and that is probably a plus for the economy in the long run.

It is hard to read those words and really think he believes them. What is going on in the minds of the people over there at the White House? Maybe the President needs to get out from behind his desk in the Oval Office, travel around the country and meet with real workers who are worried and the millions who are out of work.

Just last month President Bush came to my district. Unfortunately, his motorcade did not make any stops in our community where he had an opportunity to meet these people, those who are really worried and those who have been out of work for a very long time. If he had done that, he might have heard from people who used to work at Dixon-Ticonderoga, manufacturing school supplies and whose jobs have been moved to Mexico; nearly 2,000 workers from Phillips Electronics, who had the same thing happen to them; or Georgia Pacific-Dixie Cup, the workers who just lost their jobs last week; or those at Acuity Lighting in Vermillion, Ohio, whose jobs are being moved to Matamoros, Mexico; or the workers from Spangler Candy out in Williams County in Bryan, Ohio, whose jobs have been moved and more will be moved to Mexico, making candy canes and various sugar candies; or any number of workers on the line in our tool and die shops who have been moved out of those shops and on to the unemployment lines.

But, instead, for him it was just another campaign stop in Ohio. In fact, the day after his visit, the unemployment rate in Ohio ticked up again.

My constituents know what is important, a dependable job with a decent wage. They want to help their children complete their education, first high school and, if possible, college beyond that; and they want to be able to depend on a pension that will be there for them when they need it. But, instead, we are turning our students into debtors, our pensions are becoming more risky, and it is harder and harder for our kids to go on to school.

The 2003 trade deficit will set a record of nearly half a trillion dollars, more products being made, more services being done in other countries rather than here at home. Over a half a