

to those needs. We should not hide the true cost until after the election and risk undercutting our men and women in uniform in the field when they are at war because of politics in this political season. Let us do better in this House to fully fund our men and women in uniform.

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

(Mr. KIRK 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 Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S GROWING CREDIBILITY PROBLEM

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States introduced a budget with a \$520 billion deficit. If we look across the spectrum, not only does this budget have a fiscal deficit of historic highs of \$521 billion, the budget has a credibility deficit, blaming 9/11 and corporate scandals for the creation of this deficit. In fact, the Bush administration is continually facing a growing credibility problem not just in fiscal terms but also in policy terms at home and also overseas. America's word must be respected abroad as well as here, but the administration's word is coming under question.

If we take it from issue to issue, whether it is on the deficit, and we are running a record-high deficit, and the President wants to claim to be a fiscally responsible President, but not once in any of his budgets has he introduced a budget that is either balanced or gets to a road to balance. Not once.

In November, this House debated a \$400 billion prescription drug bill, and yet we learn that all along the administration knew it cost \$550 billion. That is for a program that we debated and understood to be \$400 billion, and not the \$400 billion, not even the \$500 billion, is paid for, driving the American taxpayer as well as our seniors further into debt.

The other day they talked about the importance of manufacturing jobs, yet they cut the manufacturing extension program which has helped small- and medium-sized manufacturers compete in the world market and add jobs.

The other day, a senior adviser to the President for economic policy announced that outsourcing of jobs was a good thing for the economy.

Mr. Speaker, the outsourcing of American jobs are a good thing for the Indian economy, not the American economy. Any administration who has a top economic adviser who believes outsourcing of jobs is a good thing is an administration with a record that has lost three million jobs in 3 years.

Whether it is on the budget that is out of whack with our values and our principles and our priorities, and as Goldman Sachs and the international monetary funds have announced, it is not even a credible budget. There is not a cent or direction in how we are going to reduce this deficit.

This President, from day one when he came into office, had a surplus north of \$100 billion. In his last budget before his reelection, he submits a deficit of \$521 billion.

In the area of jobs, three million Americans since he has been President have lost their jobs. They fake an interest in offering a manufacturing extension program and then call for its election or cuts by two-thirds.

Take the funding of police. They have advocated the importance of helping police and firefighters, talked about funding them, and in the President's budget a billion dollars was cut from the police and over \$500 million from helping our firefighters.

If we take it from area to area, from section to section, this administration says one thing and then does another. The budget is a blueprint and a document representing the values, principles and priorities of the administration as well as for the United States. I cannot think of a worse example, to have a policy in which we are presented a budget with a \$521 billion deficit, record numbers for the country. They are numbers that in my view put us at grave economic risk. We are now beholden to the Chinese and Japanese to continue to buy our securities where, God forbid, at any moment if we need their support they hold our economic security and determine our economic future, which puts us in a terribly vulnerable position.

Across the board on any number of subjects, we can watch how this administration continues both here at home to have its word questioned and also overseas has its word questioned. When a President of the United States has a credibility gap like that, it is not only endangering in my view his administration but our own economic security as Americans. We can see from the value of the dollar and the way it is falling people's judgment about the importance of our word and credibility.

On the issue of weapons of mass destruction in the recent report, that, too, is another example, and a glaring example, where the word of this administration now will be questioned rather than heeded.

In closing, as written in Time magazine, "Any of those challenges may have been manageable. The problem was that each news cycle brought a new question about the President's

judgment and candor, which Democrats lost no time exploiting. Fiscal conservatives had been howling for months about a budget that seemed totally out of control."

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

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

BUSH SPIN-DOCTORS ALTER HEALTH DISPARITIES REPORT

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) has just talked about the credibility of this administration, and there was an incident which happened yesterday which I think was really quite stunning.

Tommy Thompson, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, came before the Committee on Ways and Means. I have known him a long time. He is a dedicated, hard-working public servant. He is a straight shooter. When he appeared before us, I reluctantly had to ask my old friend tough questions. His answers were stunning. They were stunning because, without equivocation, Tommy Thompson told the truth.

Tommy Thompson acknowledged that someone significantly altered a report on health disparities in America, and he was having none of it. This is the guy who ought to be in charge, and we need help. He told the truth and took the fall for the political spin doctors inside his own agency, inside the White House, or both. We commissioned a report by the Institute of Medicine, and when it came back, it was changed. The American people need to know who did this. Significantly altering a report about health disparities in America is a betrayal of public trust. People of color, everyone in America ought to be outraged and demand accountability.

□ 1745

Political spin doctors turned science, and serious data about national health disparities affecting Native Americans, people of color and others, into a whitewash that taints anyone near it.

Let me give my colleagues an example. The first sentence of the original health disparities report circulated last June said, and I quote, "Inequalities in health care that affect some racial, ethnic, socioeconomic and geographic subpopulations in the United States ultimately affect every American." The alteration was, "The overall health of Americans has improved dramatically over the last century." One

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.