

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. LEE) Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, we are here again this evening. As I am sure many of our colleagues are aware, during the course of the past 8 months, several of us have taken to the floor to discuss issues surrounding Iraq, Afghanistan, and other issues of concern related to the war on terror, particularly as it is focused in the Middle East.

I am joined tonight by two members of that group. We call ourselves the Iraq Watch, my colleague who is sitting to my right, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE); and I know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) will soon join us.

Earlier today before the House Committee on International Relations, Secretary of State Colin Powell appeared and testified concerning the budget proposal put forth by the Department and by the administration for the coming year. The Secretary had to leave earlier than some of us would have hoped, but I commend him for bearing up, if you will, for some 3 hours before the House Committee on International Relations.

During the course of his testimony, he mentioned the tragedy that occurred in the town of Halabjah, a town he well knows because during the course of President Reagan's last 4 years he served in the capacity as the national security adviser and during the administration of George Herbert Walker Bush he served in the capacity of chief of staff of the Joint Chiefs. So he was very familiar, obviously; and many of us remember his service to the country during the Gulf War and prior to that what was occurring in the region.

If I had had an opportunity to question him, I was going to indicate to him that I have a profound concern about what we are currently doing in terms of establishing alliances and relationships with some extremely unsavory regimes that very well might come back to haunt us. Some can only be described as extremely harsh dictatorships with abysmal human rights records. Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan come to mind immediately.

Now we have a base in Uzbekistan where last year the Department of

State used the following language in describing the abuse of human rights in that particular Nation. Let me quote, "The security services routinely torture, beat and otherwise mistreat detainees. They allegedly use suffocation, electric shock, rape and other sexual abuse." The list goes on and on and on.

Of course, the budget proposal put forth by the Department of State, under the leadership of Colin Powell, directs millions of dollars to Turkmenistan, whose leader has created a Stalinist personality cult that rivals anything we saw with Saddam Hussein. He even went so far as to rename the month of January after himself and the month of April after his mother.

I remember observing the interview between Mr. Russert and President Bush this past Sunday; and the President described, appropriately so, Saddam Hussein as a madman. I might have used a different word. He might be crazy but he is not stupid. I guess is what I would say; but the new President, if you will, of Turkmenistan, who has changed his name to Turkmenibashi certainly seems to fit that particular description, and Karimov in Uzbekistan is nothing more than a thug with ambitions for regional power, again, very similar to Saddam Hussein.

When the Secretary of State alluded to Halabjah, it provoked me to think that, are we repeating the same mistakes that we made in the 1980s when the United States Government supported Saddam Hussein? Let us remember, it was the United States Government that removed Saddam Hussein from the terrorist list. We now hear that he supported terrorist groups. He was doing that in the 1980s, but the Reagan-Bush administrations removed him from the terrorist list, but they did not stop there. They went further. They restored full diplomatic relations with Saddam Hussein. In fact, they provided him credits and loan guarantees and, in fact, provided him intelligence during the course of his war with Iran.

What I found particularly disturbing, and later when one of my colleagues speaks, I have a chart that shows just a minuscule number of transfers of dual-use technologies that were approved by the Reagan-Bush administration, the Reagan-Bush White Houses, if you will, that no doubt became the building blocks of the tools for Saddam Hussein to develop that nuclear program that was discovered in the aftermath of the Gulf War. I mean, it was those White Houses, those administrations, that allowed the transfer of those dual-use technologies.

Let me tell my colleagues where I received that information: not from a newspaper report, not from a think tank with a particular bias, but with an institution that everyone in this Chamber would acknowledge is free of bias, is what we all rely on to do our research, the Congressional Research Service.

□ 2100

That particular report was authored and produced in June of 1992. But I guess what is particularly disturbing is when I hear the Secretary of State refer to Halabjah and say that we know he used chemical weapons against his own people. In this case, it was the Iraqi Kurds in the north who had aligned themselves with the Iranian forces with which Iraq was at war at the time.

The only action that I can discover in terms of my research was mild, off-the-record condemnations by the United States Government. And when this Congress back in 1988, 1989 and 1990 passed legislation, both branches independent of each other, that would have imposed sanctions on Saddam Hussein, it was the administration of George Herbert Walker Bush that blocked it. I agree obviously with the Secretary of State, he did use these weapons against his own people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, the fact is, at the time he used those weapons we were cooperating with him. The first Bush administration was cooperating with him. He was a part of our team, so to speak, because we felt it was best if Iraq would be able to prevail over Iran at the time. And then to think that, 10 or 12 years later, there is no evidence that I know of or that the administration has brought forth to show that Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons following that incident some 12 or so years ago. And then to come back after a decade and use that as an excuse to launch a preemptive war simply does not make sense.

When Saddam Hussein used these chemical weapons against his own people, our government was silent. We knew it was happening, and we were silent. And then for these self-righteous statements to be made a decade later does not make sense.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, not only were we silent, and it is very important that the historical record be revealed to the American people, and that is why we are tonight. If any viewer has any questions about the accuracy of what we state, I am sure that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and any other member of Iraq Watch, we would be happy to respond and see that the reports, unbiased, that were authored back in 1992, would be provided to anyone who has an interest. They can contact our office.

But it was not just silence. It was absolutely, according to this report, action to block the imposition of sanctions at that point in time. I dare say what would have happened if in 1988 and 1989 and 1990 there were sanctions on Iraq, that would have been a message to Saddam Hussein. We can speculate that maybe we would have avoided the first Gulf War if we had taken on that thug then. But, no, we were not

sending that message. We continued after the conclusion of the war. I have heard the argument while we tilted towards Iraq, that was the language that was used, we tilted towards Iraq because of our concern with Iran and the Ayatollah Khomeini.

As I said earlier, what are we doing now? We are allying ourselves with two more despots, two more thugs who I dare say years from now could very well be the new Saddam Husseins.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, if I may just respond, I think many of us watched the President's interview last Sunday morning with Tim Russert, and the President continuously called Saddam Hussein a madman. I have no problem with that. He is a despicable human being. The President talked about the chemical and biological threat, and he talked about the fact that he used chemicals on his own people.

What the President failed to say was that he did that in the late 1980s when the President's father was in the Oval Office, when Colin Powell was a part of the administration, and we did nothing except block the efforts of Congress to impose sanctions.

My point is all of these years later to come forth and try to use that argument to convince the American people that we should launch a preemptive war that to this point has cost over 530 precious American lives, has resulted in the injury of thousands of our troops, has consumed about \$150 billion of resources, the word "hypocrisy" comes to mind here.

The American people, when we hear that Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons against his own people, assume that we are talking about something that happened within the last few months or last few years, not over 10 years ago. When you tell a half truth or a partial truth, it gets pretty close to being a lie. I think the American people really have been manipulated, misled and purposely deceived in the kind of information that they have been given about why we needed to enter into this preemptive war.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, to point out two other facts, the initial approach to Saddam Hussein in 1983 at the direction of President Reagan was done by a special envoy.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I think that special envoy is our current Secretary of Defense.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. STRICKLAND. That is Mr. Donald Rumsfeld, and we have pictures of Mr. Rumsfeld shaking hands with Saddam Hussein. Back in those days, the fact that he was a dictator and cruel and vicious to his own people and used chemical weapons against the Kurds, back in those days it did not seem to mean a lot, apparently, because we took no action. In fact, the administration at that time actually blocked, proactively blocked, the imposition of sanctions.

Mr. DELAHUNT. In 1988, 1989, and 1990 the United States Congress took action.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Tried to, certainly.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Both the House and the Senate passed legislation that would have imposed sanctions, and it was the White House of George Herbert Walker Bush that blocked it.

Pausing again, going back in memory, who was the Secretary of Defense?

The Secretary of Defense was Mr. CHENEY, the current Vice President. His Under Secretary of Defense was Paul Wolfowitz.

So, again, the dots here have to be connected. It is important, I believe, to present that historical record to the American people to give them the information that they need to conduct their own analysis.

I challenge anyone from the administration or a Member of Congress to come to the floor and debate that particular unfortunate reality. If congressional action had been approved and the President, this President's father, had signed a bill that would have imposed sanctions, we can only speculate what would have happened.

What I would have suggested, if we knew it and we speak again of human rights and how bad and claim a certain moral authority, what should have occurred is the President of the United States should have stepped up and requested an international tribunal and brought that thug, Saddam Hussein, before it for a trial, for a prosecution, and let justice happen.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Absolutely. If I can just point out something that I think the observer of this Iraq Watch may be asking, why are these Members going so far back in history? Why are they regurgitating facts that happened more than 10 years ago?

I think it is important to point out that the same people that were responsible then are making decisions now, and the same people who I think neglected to do the right thing more than 10 years ago are the people who have advised this President and urged this President to engage in preemptive war. They are the same individuals who want to remain in power. We can only guess what their next adventure may be if, in fact, they are allowed to remain in power. They continue to advise the President. They continue to justify this preemptive war.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to share something else which I think many Americans do not fully understand, and I think they will find it interesting.

There is a story in The Hill newspaper here, which is one of the Capitol Hill newspapers, about an effort by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) to get some answers regarding something that happened in this country following the attack on September 11.

As it turns out, when our country was attacked, there were a number of

Saudi citizens, some of them relatives of Osama bin Laden, in this country. They were here in this country. As we know, most of those who flew those airplanes into the Towers and into the Pentagon and those that were responsible for the plane crash in Pennsylvania were Saudi citizens. They were not from Iraq or Iran or Syria. They were from Saudi Arabia. Now this is what gets interesting.

A few days after 9/11, a significant number of those Saudi citizens, including relatives of Osama bin Laden, were allowed to leave this country. Apparently, they were allowed to leave this country before they were ever questioned. Did they know anything about the al Qaeda terrorism network? Did Osama bin Laden's relatives who were in this country at the time perhaps know of his whereabouts?

□ 2115

We do not know. The FBI does not know because apparently they did not bother to ask the question. We are trying to find out from Attorney General John Ashcroft who made the request that these Saudi citizens be allowed to leave our country. Who made the decision to allow them to leave without being questioned? Can you imagine a few days after the attack upon our country when these pilots were Saudi citizens and we knew almost certainly that Osama bin Laden was responsible for those attacks, that members of his family, two members especially, Abdullah bin Laden and Omar bin Laden, were allowed to get on an airplane and be taken out of this country.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Has the Attorney General responded? Has he identified those officials that were responsible?

Mr. STRICKLAND. He has not responded. If I can just share this with the gentleman, at a Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee hearing just last year, Richard Clarke, who has headed the National Security Council's counterterrorism security group said, and this is a quote: "What happened was that shortly after 9/11 when it became clear that most of the terrorists of 9/11 were Saudis, the Saudi government feared that there would be retribution and vigilantism in the United States against the Saudis. That seemed to be a reasonable fear."

If our government felt that vigilantism and retribution was going to endanger the lives of these Saudi citizens and Osama's relatives who were here in this country at the time, why did they not just simply take them into protective custody, at least until the FBI had an opportunity to question them? Is it possible that the Saudi citizens and Osama bin Laden's relatives could have known about the attacks? Might they have known where Osama bin Laden was located? We will never know because our government let them leave without first of all subjecting them to questioning.

Mr. INSLEE. If the gentleman will yield, there is some additional information he may be interested in that I

have read in press accounts. Again, these are press accounts because our government to date has not shared this information with the public; but not only did this administration allow these people to leave without being fully interrogated by the FBI but the press accounts that we have read stated that while everybody else was grounded from traveling, and we know how many people had to drive across America to get home for a week or so after September 11, that this administration actually cleared a special jet that flew around the country as one of the only few planes flying in America at that time to pick up members of the bin Laden family to shepherd them out of this country as soon as possible. So not only did we not fully question these folks, we actually accommodated them flying around while John Q. Citizen could not fly himself to get from Dubuque back to Seattle.

Let me also indicate that to my knowledge, and again we do not have full information from our administration to date, but to our knowledge these people have never been interrogated by the FBI, even today, about what happened. And now we have a war in Iraq, rather than adequate research and interrogation of Saudi citizens today as to what happened on September 11.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I think it is legitimate to ask this question: Were these Saudis, were these members of Osama bin Laden's family given special treatment? Why would they have been given special treatment? Can you imagine how we would have felt, how we would have reacted if those who piloted those planes into our trade towers had been Iraqi citizens? Or Syrian citizens? Can you imagine how we would have reacted if there had been relatives of Iraqis or of Saddam Hussein in this country after such an attack? Why were the Saudis given such special treatment? Could it be because of the oil and because of the close connection between the oil industry and the Saudi government and the Bush family and the Saudi royal family? I think these are questions that deserve to be answered.

I think Attorney General Ashcroft should answer questions regarding who made the request that these citizens be allowed to leave the country without questioning. I think we should find out for certain that the FBI had said they had no interest in questioning them. I cannot imagine the FBI within days of the towers being struck saying we have no interest in questioning relatives of Osama bin Laden. I just cannot imagine that that is the case.

Mr. INSLEE. I feel very strongly that these are just some of the questions that our government has a duty to answer. One of the reasons I feel so strongly about that is that this afternoon, I had a very painful discussion with a family in Bremerton, Washington, with whom I have been working for about a week or two now whose son

and husband has been missing in Iraq, a soldier in Iraq. I have been working with this family to try to do what we could to assuage their concerns and make sure that we were doing everything we could to bring him home. Today I had to talk with that family, and they found out this morning that their son and husband would never be returning to them.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I think it is appropriate that we bring this back to the human price that is being paid for our policies, because Sunday evening back in my district in southeastern Ohio, I visited a funeral home, attended the wake of a young soldier who had just returned, a man leaving a 14-year-old son, a 5-year-old daughter, three sisters, a mother, and wife. Saturday morning I went to the air base in Youngstown, Ohio. I met with about 30 soldiers and their families and their children; and in that early morning hours as the snow was falling, I saw those soldiers get on that plane, and I saw that plane take off down that snowy runway and disappear into the heavens. Tonight those soldiers are in the desert. The fact is that as we talk about the policies of our Nation, I do think it is appropriate, and I thank the gentleman from Washington for bringing our attention to the fact that we talk about policies, we talk about decisions in an almost theoretical sense sometimes here, but the fact is that there are real families, real soldiers, real deaths, real injuries.

I also, and I will end my remarks with this, over this past weekend was able to attend a happy occasion because I went to the homecoming party of a young soldier who had just returned from Iraq. He was there with his grandfather, his father and his 4-year-old son, four generations. The mother of this 4-year-old son, the wife of this young soldier who had just returned, told me that during this soldier's absence, their 4-year-old son was so disturbed that the pediatrician suggested that he may need to go see a child psychiatrist, and she said his daddy is home and he is back to normal. Everything that we do here in this Chamber, but especially the decisions that we make regarding war and peace, affect real people, real families. I think we should never, ever forget that.

I thank the gentleman for bringing up that situation that occurred in his district as well as giving me a chance to talk about the situation in my district.

Mr. INSLEE. Unfortunately, all of us probably in every district have had these tough times with families.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I can tell of a very sad moment when I attended a funeral in my hometown of a young man, 36 years old. His widow was there; his parents were there. His dad, Charlie Caldwell, taught my daughter in the local public school. He was killed. He was killed in a humvee. When we pause and think of it, the pain that this has caused. We have had this discussion be-

fore. Not only is it causing pain today; but in very real terms with the cost of this effort, if you will, we have already spent \$187 billion. And while it is not in the President's budget, because clearly he has an interest in not increasing the deficit any more than it is and it is absolutely out of control, we know that and I think the American people know that, but we hear, and it has been reported that there is an additional \$50 billion that will be in a supplemental. Of course, it will not happen before the election. But if I can just for one minute, because I want to go back, I want to let those who are watching, and maybe it is impossible, they cannot see this list; but this is just a small piece of exports to Iraq by U.S. companies from the year 1985 to 1990.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Can I ask a question about that, because the heading across the gentleman's chart says "Licensed Dual Use Exports to Iraq by U.S. Companies, 1985 to 1990." When we use the phrase "dual use," does that mean that what has been exported can be used perhaps for legitimate purposes but also could be used for illegitimate military purposes or offensive purposes if that government chose to use them in that way?

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is absolutely the correct definition. I think sometimes when we speak among ourselves because we know the terms, we seem to forget that oftentimes viewers and constituents and others, really, I am sure they are wondering, what are we talking about. I really thank the gentleman for making that clear. Yes, dual use means they can be used for peaceful purposes, or they can be used for the development of programs such as the nuclear program that Saddam Hussein began, started. It was well along the way in terms of its development when in 1990 during the Gulf War he was defeated, and under the agreement, the U.N. inspectors went in and found that, yes, he did have a nuclear program at that point in time. Actually, the United Nations inspection team did a superb job. But where did the technologies come from for the development of Saddam Hussein's nuclear weapon program? It is right here.

Let me just read several. There are computers for possible use in nuclear weapons development. Computers useful for missile development. Computers that U.N. inspectors believed monitored uranium enrichment for atomic bomb fuel. Computers useful for graphic design of atomic bombs and missiles. Computers for manufacturing tool design and graphics. Computers for possible use in atomic bomb or missile development. This is the moneys that were paid to American firms under a license approved in the first Bush administration.

Mr. STRICKLAND. From 1985 to 1990?

Mr. DELAHUNT. From 1985 to 1990. Again, I just do not think that we can overstate the historical record because I think it provides the American people, particularly those who are watching us here tonight, with information

for them to reach their own conclusions. The reality is, he did have chemical weapons; and as Secretary Powell indicated today, they knew he had chemical weapons when they launched Desert Storm in the first Gulf War and our soldiers were prepared; but, of course, he did not use them.

□ 2130

He did not use them. He only used them against his own people.

Mr. STRICKLAND. More than 10 years ago.

Mr. DELAHUNT. In 1988 in Halabja, and he murdered somewhere between 5,000 and 10,000 Iraqi Kurds, and we were silent then when we should have imposed the sanctions and insisted that he be brought to trial. So that is the full story. That is the full story.

Again, today, Secretary Powell continued to talk about intent. And there was evidence of intent, and I hear Dr. Rice, Condoleezza Rice, we know he used them. Yes. Back in 1988 and 1989, and we did nothing then, and here we are in 2002.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, may I point out something to my friend. The U.N. inspections worked. The U.N. inspectors were in Iraq. They were asking for additional time. It was this government that terminated the inspections right before this war began. And the fact is that if the inspections had continued, we would have uncovered the fact that these weapons of mass destruction did not exist in Iraq at the present time. And it is so sad, it is tragic that we rushed to a decision, that we told the U.N. inspectors their time was up and that we initiated this preemptive war. And we cannot, we must not, forget that over 530 of our fellow Americans have lost their lives, and we are losing lives in Iraq every day, and there is no end in sight.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, just to pick up on the gentleman's point that in terms of the work that the U.N. teams did, respectively it has been established that there were no stockpiles. There were no weapons of mass destruction. In fact, David Kay, appointed by President Bush, came back and told the American people, to use his words, we were all wrong. I think it is so important to analyze and understand all of the dots here and what lies in the future. As I said in my opening remarks, we are now creating alliances and working with people who rival Saddam Hussein in terms of their tyranny, their abuse of human rights, and their willingness to do anything to enhance their power.

I mentioned earlier we have a military base in Uzbekistan. And the President of Uzbekistan, here he is with our Secretary of Defense. The gentleman, if the Members will, to Secretary Rumsfeld's right, his name is Karimov, Islam Karimov. He is a tyrant. He is a thug, and we are in bed with him. The American people should know that. In Turkmenistan, I had mentioned earlier the leader of Turkmenistan, and we are

sending him millions of dollars. Talk about a madman. He is a certifiable nut, changing the names of the calendar, April for his mother and January for himself. What are we doing? We are making the same mistake, and that is why it is important that those that are watching Iraq Watch tonight take this information, read on their own, and look to the future and understand that we are now or could be planting the seeds for another Saddam Hussein that will wreak havoc in the region, that obviously these two will continue to abuse human rights and what about our claim to moral authority when we are losing prestige in the world today?

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, because he is bringing up moral authority, which is very important; and we were talking about the families we have been working with who have lost their sons and daughters in Iraq, and there is a moral obligation by the United States Government to come forward and answer some of these questions that we have been asking tonight. And the gentleman mentioned something about reading and some folks may find some reading material of interest. I want to refer to people about a moral question that our government owes to the American people, and that is the question of how this war was started based on what, according to Mr. Kay, was a false premise.

The people of this country, the families who have servicepeople serving in Iraq, those who have lost members of their families, they deserve a clear, cogent, and complete answer of how a war was started based on a false premise about what the status of weapons was in Iraq. And the gentleman mentioned things he was reading. I read something extremely disturbing to me this weekend. It was printed in the Knight Ridder newspapers. I read it in the Seattle Times February 10, an article entitled "Doubts and Dissent Removed from Public Report on Iraq. Secret version President Bush received was more cautious about threat."

We know at this point, according to Mr. Kay, our expert in the field and now even according to the President apparently, that the premise that gave rise to this war was false about the status of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. And that is disturbing enough. It is it disturbing for our soldiers and sailors. It is disturbing of our standing in the world, starting a war on a false premise. But this article was more disturbing to me because the conclusion and premise of this article was not only was this premise false but that the Government of the United States of America in a sense distorted in significant ways the nature of intelligence that it had available to it before the war started. For instance, and again this is in the newspaper, and I cannot vouch for its authenticity. It makes reference to some intelligence reports. This is not coming from myself. It is coming from the Seattle Times and the

Knight Ridder newspaper. But they made reference to a statement essentially by the President that there is no doubt, and that is a quote from this President, that the President of the United States looked at the American people and said there is no doubt, no doubt, that Iraq had some of the most lethal weapons systems devised by man before this war started.

But this article disclosed that the intelligence reports given to the President of the United States showed there was tremendous doubt about this situation. And I will quote from this article: "Whereas the President of the United States was essentially saying there is no doubt that Iraq had reconstituted, in the words of the Vice President, a nuclear program." Listen to what the intelligence report said, according to this article, that was given to the President of the United States. This was an intelligence report prepared by the State Department's intelligence arm, which is called the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, known as the INR.

This is a quote. That report said "the activities we have detected do not, however, add up to a compelling case that Iraq is currently pursuing what INR would consider to be an integrated and comprehensive approach to acquire nuclear weapons. Iraq may be doing so, but INR considers the available evidence inadequate to support such a judgment." The report goes on to say, "INR is unwilling to project a timeline for the completion of activities it does not now see happening."

So while the President of the United States, the leader of the free world, was telling the world and American soldiers and sailors and citizens that there was no doubt that this country had a meaningful, real, and contemporaneous nuclear program, our own intelligence services, at least one of them, was telling him they did not think so. This was not told to the American people. And even if one believes today that this war was totally justified based on the civil rights of the Iraqi citizens, and I respect people who have that view, even if one believes that, it is a moral wrong not to share this information with the American people and the U.S. Congress when this debate is going on.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INSLEE. I have one more point I want to be sure I make, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, when the President was interviewed on Sunday, he told the American people that the Congress had the same intelligence available to them as he had available to him. And that was not true. No one told us that there was ambiguity. The President and the Vice President spoke with surety. They said, as the gentleman has pointed out, there was no doubt.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I should interrupt the gentleman to say that Secretary

Powell made that statement again. And not having had the opportunity because he left early, I was stunned by that particular remark. I do not know any Member in this body that had these different reports. With the caveats and the qualifiers, what we got was something different, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STRICKLAND. We cannot even find out who served on the Vice President's energy task force, let alone have access to all the intelligence that the President has available.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, let me make a point, because I think it is important. It is not just this nuclear threat. As the gentlemen know, Condoleezza Rice made repeated references to the mushroom cloud, which is a most disturbing image to all of us having suffered through September 11, and a real potential threat from Iran and North Korea. But it is not just the nuclear threat, but the American people were not given the full scoop in this regard.

The gentlemen will recall when the President and others made repeated references to the unmanned aerial vehicles that they told us was a threat to the continental United States, that Iraq could fly over American cities and spray biological material over the United States and none of us can always ever eliminate any threat. Today somebody may be planning to do that today as we speak. I do not want to be Pollyanna-ish about this, but the President told us that our intelligence services were telling us that was going on.

According to this article, let me tell the gentlemen what the United States Air Force was telling the President of the United States. What it said was: "The Air Force does not agree that Iraq is developing UAVs, unmanned aerial vehicles, primarily intended to be delivery platforms for chemical and biological warfare, CBW agents. The small size of Iraq's new UAV strongly suggests a primary role of reconnaissance, although CBW delivery is an inherent capability." We were told that Iraq was developing these weapons that could fly over Philadelphia and spray biological and anthrax over it when the Air Force was telling the President of the United States they did not believe that was the case.

Let me finish one more point. During our national debate, I respected the President of the United States' statement that Saddam Hussein was a tyrant and a thug and was massively abusive to his own people, and perhaps he rightfully argued that he believed preemptive action was appropriate. That is an argument we would respect and listen to. But during this national debate, before this President sent our citizens to die in the sands of Iraq, he did not owe us 30 percent of the truth. He did not owe us 75 percent of the truth. He owed us the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Hans Blix, who was defamed mightily by this administration prior to this war, I think said it

best when he got this information. He said, "We deserve more than what a car salesman might give."

□ 2145

We deserve the whole truth."

If these reports are accurate, again, I have not seen these, but I read about them in the newspaper, if these reports are accurate, we need to get to the bottom of what happened here. That is why this commission that the President has appointed needs to take it upon itself not only to look at the bureaucracy at the Central Intelligence Agency, but they need to know why the President of the United States and his administration was not entirely forthcoming about the intelligence in this regard.

Mr. DELAHUNT. You know what I would like to do? I would commend for reading, to those that are watching us have this conversation tonight, this Newsweek article. It is the publication of November 17, 2003, 4 or 5 months ago. Obviously, this is a picture of the Vice President, and it is entitled "How Dick Cheney Sold the War: The Inside Story."

Again, I think we and the citizens have an obligation to do as much homework as we can to fully understand the reality. Those points that the gentleman made, I have heard them on the floor today. Earlier the President went to Poland and spoke about those two mobile trailers that allegedly were being used in a bio-weapon program. The CIA refuted that. Again, it is important to be accurate.

It is interesting, everybody in Washington at least knows and the American people should know that there has been tension within the administration between the Vice President on one side and Secretary Powell on the other side. If I had had an opportunity today, I was going to ask the Secretary if this story in The Washington Post was accurate.

There was a lengthy article; and it was, again, published on February 1 of this year. If you remember, when Secretary Powell went before the United Nations, what the article relates is that he was very careful and thorough in terms of what he believed to be accurate intelligence, and he had this CIA analyst come in and discuss it with him.

The CIA originally drafted his speech, which then went to the White House. But when it emerged, it looked entirely different. The Vice President's chief of staff, one individual by the name of Scooter Libby, and his National Security Advisor, Stephen Hadley, and other national security staffers had produced draft language for Powell, 45 pages on weapons of mass destruction, 38 pages on alleged links to terrorism, and 16 pages on Iraq's human rights abuses. Within 1 day, Powell's task force had largely abandoned the 45-page document on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction produced by Cheney's office and the National Se-

curity Council, using instead a classified National Intelligence Estimate assembled by the CIA in October.

Again, let me suggest this: a vision and a view and an ideology that had a conclusion and was looking for facts. We all know in the selection of facts, and, again, this can be done without even a conscious intent to deceive, but the attempt to make the case like lawyers do in a courtroom. But this is not a courtroom; this is not advocacy.

But, again, I was going to ask the Secretary, was that report true. When that speech that he had prepared had come out of the White House, out of the Vice President's office, changed so dramatically, did he abandon it and go and rely on the National Intelligence Estimate?

Do you know what? The American people have a right to know that process, the world has a right to know that process, because that was a presentation to the world by the representative of the United States to the world.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for February 10 and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTIERREZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. COOPER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. HOFFEL, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINGREY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
 Mr. GILCHREST, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.