

This triggers a change in the policy of the international coalition fighting al Qaeda. We should make this change. We should raise the rewards for catching bin Laden and attack his heroin organization.

There are at least three major drug trafficking organizations now operating in Afghanistan, all with links to Pakistan: The Taliban, the HIG and bin Laden's al Qaeda. Last week, coalition forces made their first effort and hit a major drug lab in eastern Afghanistan that captured \$100 million worth of heroin that could have supported terror against the West.

Next week, I will be offering legislation to increase the rewards for the capture of terrorists but to also expand the rewards program to involve the rewards program in capturing narco-terrorists, and also to loosen up that rewards program so that we can provide valuable commodities which speak much more directly to the rural families in Pakistan and Afghanistan, providing, for example, motorcycles, farm implements or trucks for the capture of these well-known terrorists. The terrorists are changing their source of financing and the United States needs to change its strategy to dry up that financing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ISSA 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 the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her 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. SHUSTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

INTRODUCTION OF UNITED STATES SEAPORT MULTIYEAR SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the President's message last night on the critical need for security enhancement around our seaports and airports, I am introducing legislation today, the United States Seaport Multiyear Security Enhancement Act, and I ask all of my colleagues to support it. This is a bipartisan issue. Seaport security continues to be an ongoing national concern that Congress cannot afford to ignore any longer.

The United States Seaport Multiyear Security Enhancement Act is much-needed legislation that seeks to provide a steady, predictable stream of funding for port security projects. In short, this legislation creates a port security grant program within the Homeland Security Department. Our Nation's 361 seaports are considered a major terrorist target. It is known that al Qaeda has strong ties to the shipping industry and that one of the aims of this terrorist network is to weaken the economic security of our country. Our Nation's coastline is our longest border, which is a 95,000-mile coast that includes the Great Lakes and inland waterways.

Protecting America's seaports is critical to the Nation's economic growth, vitality and security. Seaports handle 95 percent of our Nation's overseas trade by volume, support the mobilization and deployment of U.S. Armed Forces and serve as transit points for millions of cruise and ferry passengers. Maritime industries contribute \$742 billion per year to the U.S. gross national product.

The United States Coast Guard has issued final regulations that call for immediate and long-term investment in securing our seaports. According to the U.S. Coast Guard, implementing these regulations that directly address our seaport security needs will cost \$1.125 billion in the first year and \$5.45 billion over 10 years. To date, security funding to our seaports has been woefully underfunded. Congress has provided \$442 million in seaport security funding through three rounds of competitive grant funding and from the Office of Domestic Preparedness. Given our Nation's economic dependence on our seaports and our ongoing national security concerns, Mr. Speaker, seaport security funding and the need for Federal support for our Nation's security should be ongoing.

Given the enormity of these seaport capital infrastructure projects, my legislation seeks to do the following: Establish a multiyear seaport grant program that resembles the letter of intent measures established in the aviation security program. And it calls for multiyear grants and \$800 million per year for port security grant funding. The program would be authorized for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is much needed. According to the Department of Homeland Security, to date, \$1 out of every \$10 requested for port security grants is funded. That is one out of 10. The continuing security and economic needs that face our Nation and our seaports should be recognized by the establishment of the U.S. Seaport Multiyear Security Enhancement Act, the legislation that I am introducing

today. I ask all of my colleagues for their support of this very important piece of legislation.

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

(Mr. FOLEY 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 Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS 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 Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE 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 Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois 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. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

DO NOT TRIVIALIZE NEED TO INTERNATIONALIZE IRAQ

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last night in his State of the Union address to the Nation, President Bush attempted to deride critics who have called upon him to broaden the coalition and internationalize the effort to provide security to Iraq and rebuild that war-torn nation. The President said, "This particular criticism is hard to explain to our partners in Britain." And then he named 15 other countries and cited 17 others.

I respect the contributions that these other nations have made in Iraq, some of which like Spain, Italy and Japan have also lost sons to the war in Iraq.

But let us not be disingenuous on the subject of our allies in Iraq. With the exception of the United Kingdom, none are engaged in the arduous combat-related work that confronts the 130,000 American troops in Iraq who have endured over 500 dead and thousands of wounded among their ranks. And none carry the financial burden that the American taxpayer provides for the security of Iraq. President Bush should not trivialize the need to create a genuine international coalition capable of sharing the burdens of building a safe, secure and democratic Iraq.

I would like to have heard President Bush talk about how the United States needs the help, support and expertise of the United Nations, which has also paid in blood for our Iraq policy to ensure that the democracy-building and election process in Iraq are inclusive and successful. I would have liked to have heard President Bush talk about how the international community could help in the prosecution of Saddam Hussein so that his trial has credibility both inside and outside Iraq. I would have liked to have heard just one word from President Bush that indicates that he gets it, that he understands the United States must work with allies, NATO and the United Nations in order to secure the manpower and money necessary for a secure and stable Iraq. Certainly those of us concerned about the resources of our Federal budget understand this as we prepare to receive another supplemental spending request for at least \$50 billion sometime later this year. That is \$50 billion in addition to the more than \$120 billion we have already spent so far on Iraq over the last year.

And, most of all, our troops on the ground understand this, including the members and families of our National Guard and Reserves who have served so valiantly, despite open-ended deployments and equipment shortages. But President Bush simply does not get it and last night he outlined how he will stay on the same go-it-alone course that has so alienated the rest of the world, diminished the credibility of U.S. foreign policy and intelligence, undermined international institutions, and left us resented rather than respected.

I do not believe the United States needs a permission slip to act when our security is genuinely threatened, but we now know that with Iraq, our security was never in imminent danger. There were no weapons of mass destruction. Instead, last night the President talked about "weapons of mass destruction-related program activities," whatever that means. There were no ties to Osama bin Laden, whose name the President never even mentioned last night.

□ 1330

There was only a driving hunger to overthrow the Iraqi regime from the moment this administration entered the White House.

The unilateral and arrogant way in which the Bush administration has handled the Iraq war and its aftermath has resulted in a U.S. occupation that has cost us dearly in terms of human life and precious resources. It would have been nice if the President had even acknowledged last night the 500 American soldiers who have sacrificed their lives in Iraq and the thousands more who have been wounded.

Mr. Speaker, the exaggeration and the manipulation of intelligence and our changing rationales for our involvement have diminished the credibility and standing of the United States around the globe in ways that I truly believe undermine our security. Now we have a moral obligation to rebuild Iraq and to safeguard the Iraqi people, and we can only do that successfully with the help and support of the United Nations and the broader international community. It would have been nice if President Bush had taken just a few seconds in an hour-long speech to acknowledge that reality last night.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 2004]

ARMS ISSUE SEEN AS HURTING U.S.

CREDIBILITY ABROAD

(By Glenn Kessler)

The Bush administration's inability to find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq—after public statements declaring an imminent threat posed by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein—has begun to harm the credibility abroad of the United States and of American intelligence, according to foreign policy experts in both parties.

In last year's State of the Union address, President Bush used stark imagery to make the case that military action was necessary. Among other claims, Bush said that Hussein had enough anthrax to "kill several million people," enough botulinum toxin to "subject millions of people to death by respiratory failure" and enough chemical agents to "kill untold thousands."

Now, as the president prepared for this State of the Union address Tuesday, those frightening images of death and destruction have been replaced by a different reality: Few of the many claims made by the administration have been confirmed after months of searching by weapons inspectors.

Within the United States, Bush does not appear to have suffered much political damage from the failure to find weapons, with polls showing high ratings for his handling of the war and little concern that he misrepresented the threat.

But a range of foreign policy experts, including supporters of the war, said the long-term consequences of the administration's rhetoric could be severe overseas—especially because the war was waged without the backing of the United Nations and was opposed by large majorities, even in countries run by leaders that supported the invasion.

"The foreign policy blow-back is pretty serious," said Kenneth Adelman, member of the Pentagon's Defense Advisory Board and a supporter of the war. He said the gaps between the administration's rhetoric and the postwar findings threaten Bush's doctrine of "preemption," which envisions attacking a nation because it is an imminent threat.

The doctrine "rests not just on solid intelligence," Adelman said, but "also on the credibility that the intelligence is solid."

Already, in the crisis over North Korea's nuclear ambitions, China has rejected U.S.

intelligence that North Korea has a secret program to enrich uranium for use in weapons. China is a key player in resolving the North Korean standoff, but its refusal to embrace the U.S. intelligence has disappointed U.S. officials and could complicate negotiations to eliminate North Korea's weapons programs.

Richard Haass, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, said the same problem could occur if the United States presses for action against alleged weapons programs in Iran and Syria. The solution, he said, is to let international organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency take the lead in making the case, as has happened thus far in Iran, and also to be willing to share more of the intelligence with other countries.

The inability to find suspected weapons "has to make it more difficult on some future occasion if the United States argues the intelligence warrants something controversial, like a preventive attack," said Haass, a Republican who was head of policy planning for Secretary of State Colin L. Powell when the war started. "The result is we've made the bar higher for ourselves and we have to expect greater skepticism in the future."

James Steinberg, a deputy national security adviser in the Clinton administration who believed there were legitimate concerns about Iraq's weapons programs, said the failure of the prewar claims to match the postwar reality "add to the general sense of criticism about the U.S., that we will do anything, say anything" to prevail.

Indeed, whenever Powell grants interviews to foreign news organizations, he is often hit with a question about the search for weapons of mass destruction. Last Friday, a British TV reporter asked whether in retirement he would "admit that you had concerns about invading Iraq," and a Dutch reporter asked whether he ever had doubts about the Iraq policy.

"There's no doubt in my mind that he had the intention, he had the capability," Powell responded. "How many weapons he had or didn't have, that will be determined."

Some on Capitol Hill believe the issue is so important that they are pressing the president to address the apparent intelligence failure in the State of the Union address and propose ways to fix it.

"I believe that unanswered questions regarding the accuracy and reliability of U.S. intelligence have created a credibility gap and left the nation in a precarious position," Rep. Jane Harman (Calif.), the senior Democrat on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, said in a speech last week. "The intelligence community seems to be in a state of denial, and the administration seems to have moved on."

Since last year's State of the Union, the White House has established procedures for handling intelligence in presidential speeches by including a CIA officer in the speech-writing process. The CIA is also conducting an internal review, comparing prewar estimates with postwar findings, and the final report will be finished after inspectors in Iraq complete their work.

But Bush and his aides have largely sought to divert attention from the issue. White House aides have said they expect this year's State of the Union speech to look ahead—to the democracy the administration hopes to establish in Iraq—rather than look back.

Officials also have turned the focus to celebrating Hussein's capture last month and repeatedly drawing attention to Hussein's mistreatment of his people. Officials have argued that if Iraq's stocks of weapons are still unclear, Hussein's intentions to again possess such weapons are not. Thirteen years ago, when the United States was a backer of

Hussein, Iraq used chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war.

The administration "rid the Iraqi people of a murderous dictator, and rid the world of a menace to our future peace and security," Vice President Cheney said in a speech last week. Cheney—and other U.S. officials—increasingly point to Libya's decision last month to give up its weapons of mass destruction as a direct consequence of challenging Iraq.

Bush, when asked by ABC's Diane Sawyer why he said Iraq had weapons of mass destruction when intelligence pointed more to the possibility Hussein would obtain such weapons, dismissed the question: "So, what's the difference?"

The U.S. team searching for Iraq's weapons has not issued a report since October, but in recent weeks the gap between administration claims and Iraq's actual weapons holdings has become increasingly clear. The Washington Post reported earlier this month that U.S. investigators have found no evidence that Iraq had a hidden cache of old chemical or biological weapons, and that its nuclear program had been shattered after the 1991 Persian Gulf War. A lengthy study issued by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace also concluded the administration shifted the intelligence consensus on Iraq's weapons in 2002 as officials prepared for war, making it appear more imminent and threatening than was warranted by the evidence.

The report further said that the administration "systematically misrepresented the threat" posed by Iraq, often on purpose, in four ways: one, treating nuclear, chemical and biological weapons as a single threat, although each posed different dangers and evidence was particularly thin on Iraq's nuclear and chemical programs; two, insisting without evidence that Hussein would give his weapons to terrorists; three, often dropping caveats and uncertainties contained in the intelligence assessments when making public statements; and four, misrepresenting inspectors' findings so that minor threats were depicted as emergencies.

Jessica T. Mathews, president of the Carnegie Endowment and co-author of the report, pointed to one example in a speech delivered by Bush in Cincinnati on Oct. 7, 2002. U.N. inspectors had noted that Iraq had failed to account for bacterial growth media that, if used, "could have produced about three times as much" anthrax as Iraq had admitted. But Bush, in his speech, turned a theoretical possibility into a fact.

"The inspectors, however, concluded that Iraq had likely produced two to four times that amount," Bush said. "This is a massive stockpile of biological weapons that has never been accounted for and is capable of killing millions."

Mathews said her research showed the administration repeatedly and frequently took such liberties with the intelligence and inspectors' findings to bolster its cases for immediate action. In the Cincinnati example, "in 35 words, you go from probably to a likelihood to a fact," she said. "With a few little changes in wording, you turn an 'if' into a dire biological weapons stockpile. Anyone hearing that must be thinking, 'My God, this is an imminent threat.'"

Steinberg, who was privy to the intelligence before President Bill Clinton left office, said that while at the National Security Council he saw no evidence Iraq had reconstituted its nuclear weapons program, but that there were unresolved questions about Hussein's chemical and biological weapons programs. "Given his reluctance to address these questions, you had to conclude he was hiding something," he said, adding that given the intelligence he saw, "I certainly expected something would have turned up."

"I think there are [diplomatic] consequences as a result of the president asking these questions [about Iraq's weapons holdings] and the answer being no" weapons, said Danielle Pletka, vice president for foreign and defense policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute, who believes the ouster of Hussein justified the war. "The intelligence could have been better."

Richard Perle, another member of the Defense Advisory Board, said the criticism of the Bush administration is unfair. "Intelligence is not an audit," he said. "It's the best information you can get in circumstances of uncertainty, and you use it to make the best prudent judgment you can."

He added that presidents in particular tend not to place qualifiers on their statements, especially when they are advocating a particular policy. "Public officials tend to avoid hedging," he said.

Given the stakes involved—going to war—Mathews said the standards must be higher for such statements. "The most important call a president can make by a mile is whether to take a country to war," she argued, making the consequences of unwise decisions or misleading statements even greater.

Indeed, she said, the reverberations are still being felt, even as the administration tries to put the problem behind it. A recent CBS poll found that only 16 percent of those surveyed believed the administration lied about Iraq's weapons. But she said there is intense interest in the report's findings, with 35,000 copies downloaded from the think tank's Web site in just five days. "It is too soon to say there was no cost" to the failure to find weapons, she said. "I think there is a huge appetite for learning about this."

SOLUTIONS FOR SKYROCKETING HEALTH CARE COSTS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last year's 9½ percent increase in health care spending and costs was the largest in 11 years. Our health care spending per capita doubles that of European nations; yet 43 million Americans have no health care coverage and millions more receive inadequate care.

Many Americans listened to the State of the Union address last night in hopes of hearing solutions to skyrocketing prescription drug costs and insurance costs, driven largely by the uninsured who show up in hospitals and emergency rooms seeking care, forcing all of us who do have health care to pay what I call an uninsured premium, which is one of the great causes of our health care inflation in this country.

Unfortunately, the President's speech did not propose new ways to tackle these problems. The President touted his Medicare bill but ignored the fact that that bill does nothing to address skyrocketing prescription drug prices. We pay in this country 40 to 50 percent more than Canadians and Europeans pay for the same prescription drugs.

To address the worsening problem of the uninsured, the President referred again to a refundable tax credit worth \$1,000. The reality is in the market-

place it is impossible to find plans, individual plans, for \$1,000 worth of any health care coverage, coverage none of us in Congress would take at all.

Until we commit ourselves to market-based solutions that embrace the principle of competition and choice, we will not bring down health care prices and costs. Access problems will only get worse for the uninsured and insured.

By asking our taxpayers to spend \$400 billion on a Medicare prescription drug bill while paying the most expensive prices in the world, we are short-changing our seniors, and we are short-changing our taxpayers. They deserve the common decency and courtesy to get the best prices in the world, not the most expensive prices.

By not taking steps to lower all health insurance costs through market-based, cost-effective solutions, we are compromising the care all Americans receive who are struggling to try to pay for the premium increases and cost increases in their health care system.

Prescription drug spending increased by 15.3 percent in 2003. In Europe, where there is competition and choice for medications, prices on average are 40 percent below what they are here in the United States. In every other industry, food, software, cars, consumer electronics, worldwide competition keeps prices down here in the United States; yet for pharmaceutical drugs, we have a closed market, and we pay the most expensive prices in the world.

Polls show that more than two thirds of Americans think they should be able to purchase drugs from Canada and Europe; yet the final Medicare bill did not include these provisions. President Bush should work with Congress this year to lower prescription drug prices through greater reliance on competition and market forces and not threaten to veto such legislation. To do this, we should continue to work for market access legislation similar to the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act, which passed the House last year.

We should also expand the limited provisions in the Medicare bill to increase access to generics. We should remove the provision on the Medicare bill that prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from doing both negotiation, setting up a Sam's Club-like entity of Medicare and using the 41 million seniors who purchase prescription drugs to reduce prices, just like the Veterans Administration and just like private plans.

The other major skyrocketing health care cost for the rest of us is the uninsured, and this is not just a problem for the poor. The fastest-growing group of people who are working without health care are people who earn \$50,000 to \$75,000 a year. The uninsured in this country who work is a middle-class problem.

Today, all insured Americans pay an uninsured premium in their taxes and their insurance policies, but all the