



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2005

No. 151

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 15, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LOUIE GOHMERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

PRESIDENT BUSH CAN'T REWRITE HISTORY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, beginning on Veterans Day, President Bush has begun a series of attacks against his critics on the war in Iraq. He has been supported by a well-orchestrated set of groupies of conservative policymakers, Members of Congress and talking heads all spouting the same line, that the Bush Administration was not alone in believing that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. Everyone thought so. And the administration

certainly did not manipulate or misrepresent any intelligence to Congress, the American people or to the international community.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more false claim in a history of falsehoods put forward by this administration in its effort to cover up its failures in Iraq. Today's New York Times editorial attempts to set the record straight on the Bush coverup of the truth.

On Veterans Day, President Bush claimed that Congress had access to the same intelligence as his administration. This is patently false. According to the Washington Post and The New York Times, President Bush and his aides had access to much more voluminous intelligence information than did lawmakers, who are dependent on his administration to provide Congress with materials.

More recently, the President has asserted that Congress had more intelligence information than the White House. This is so patently absurd, I barely know how to respond. The only intelligence materials the Congress has, it receives from the President and his administration.

The President has gone on to state that the bipartisan investigation carried out by the Senate Intelligence Committee found, and I again quote, no evidence of political pressure to change the intelligence community's judgments related to Iraq's weapons programs.

This claim is wrong on several counts. First, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence has not yet done its inquiry into whether Bush officials mischaracterized or misrepresented intelligence.

Second, the Senate Intelligence Committee's first report did find that the national intelligence estimate was manipulated.

Finally, the overall soft approach of this first report by the Senate Intel-

ligence Committee has been disputed by several senior intelligence officials. Richard Kerr, the former acting CIA director, who led an internal investigation of the CIA's failure to correctly analyze Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability, stated that the intelligence analysts were pressured and heavily so. Senators ROCKEFELLER, DURBIN and LEVIN noted in their additional views to the Senate Intelligence Committee's report that the CIA's independent review found, and I quote, significant pressure on the intelligence community to find evidence that supported a connection between Iraq and al Qaeda.

A second independent investigation by the CIA ombudsman found that the, quote, hammering by the Bush Administration on Iraq intelligence was unusual and that George Tenet confirmed that agency officials had raised with him personally the matter of pressure on analysts.

President Bush tries to assert that President Clinton believed in the same threat. What he leaves out is that President Clinton has repeatedly asserted that he believes it was a mistake to invade Iraq before the United Nations weapons inspectors had a chance to complete their investigation. In fact, the U.N. investigation was aborted before it even had a chance to really begin by the launch of U.S. military operations.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush asserts that other governments' intelligence agencies agreed with ours. That is simply false. Many countries felt that the U.S. intelligence was faulty or overblown and did not agree with their own intelligence data, and that is why they opposed us in the United Nations Security Council or declined to provide troops for our invasion. Even this year we have heard Vice President CHENEY continue to imply that Iraq was somehow tied to the September 11 attacks and was developing weapons of mass destruction.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H10163

Well, let us set the record straight. There were no weapons of mass destruction, there were no ties to al Qaeda, there was no imminent threat. The arguments in favor of war presented to Congress and the American people by the President deliberately used the most inflammatory of language.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one more word on the President's latest series of attacks. He says that those of us who criticize the war, who called for withdrawal, or who focused on how the American people were deliberately misled into supporting the invasion on Iraq, that somehow we are betraying our troops and advocating a cut-and-run strategy.

Mr. Speaker, our troops, who have carried out this mission with courage, dignity and sacrifice, represent our Nation with honor, but they have been betrayed. They have been betrayed by policymakers who rushed into a war on false pretenses, they were betrayed by policymakers who sent them into harm's way and overruled the good advice of our top military leaders as to troop strength and post-invasion planning, and they have been betrayed by policymakers who will not admit that mistakes were made and significant changes in policy are required in order to bring them home safe and sound.

Critics of this policy strongly support reconstruction assistance for Iraq. We strongly support the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces. We strongly support internationally supported security forces in Iraq. We do not support cutting and running, but we do not support lying and hiding. Mr. Bush cannot rewrite history, he cannot rewrite the intelligence again, and he cannot continue to lie to the American people. The truth, the ugly truth, is coming out.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 2005]

DECODING MR. BUSH'S DENIALS

To avoid having to account for his administration's misleading statements before the war with Iraq, President Bush has tried denial, saying he did not skew the intelligence. He's tried to share the blame, claiming that Congress had the same intelligence he had, as well as President Bill Clinton. He's tried to pass the buck and blame the C.I.A. Lately, he's gone on the attack, accusing Democrats in Congress of aiding the terrorists.

Yesterday in Alaska, Mr. Bush trotted out the same tedious deflection on Iraq that he usually attempts when his back is against the wall: he claims that questioning his actions three years ago is a betrayal of the troops in battle today.

It all amounts to one energetic effort at avoidance. But like the W.M.D. reports that started the whole thing, the only problem is that none of it has been true.

Mr. Bush says everyone had the same intelligence he had—Mr. Clinton and his advisers, foreign governments, and members of Congress—and that all of them reached the same conclusions. The only part that is true is that Mr. Bush was working off the same intelligence Mr. Clinton had. But that is scary, not reassuring. The reports about Saddam Hussein's weapons were old, some more than 10 years old. Nothing was fresher than about five years, except reports that later proved to be fanciful.

Foreign intelligence services did not have full access to American intelligence. But some had dissenting opinions that were ignored or not shown to top American officials. Congress had nothing close to the President's access to intelligence. The National Intelligence Estimate presented to Congress a few days before the vote on war was sanitized to remove dissent and make conjecture seem like fact.

It's hard to imagine what Mr. Bush means when he says everyone reached the same conclusion. There was indeed a widespread belief that Iraq had chemical and biological weapons. But Mr. Clinton looked at the data and concluded that inspections and pressure were working—a view we now know was accurate. France, Russia and Germany said war was not justified. Even Britain admitted later that there had been no new evidence about Iraq, just new politics.

The administration had little company in saying that Iraq was actively trying to build a nuclear weapon. The evidence for this claim was a dubious report about an attempt in 1999 to buy uranium from Niger, later shown to be false, and the infamous aluminum tubes story. That was dismissed at the time by analysts with real expertise.

The Bush administration was also alone in making the absurd claim that Iraq was in league with Al Qaeda and somehow connected to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. That was based on two false tales. One was the supposed trip to Prague by Mohamed Atta, a report that was disputed before the war and came from an unreliable drunk. The other was that Iraq trained Qaeda members in the use of chemical and biological weapons. Before the war, the Defense Intelligence Agency concluded that this was a deliberate fabrication by an informer.

Mr. Bush has said in recent days that the first phase of the Senate Intelligence Committee's investigation on Iraq found no evidence of political pressure to change the intelligence. That is true only in the very narrow way the Republicans on the committee insisted on defining pressure: as direct pressure from senior officials to change intelligence. Instead, the Bush administration made what it wanted to hear crystal clear and kept sending reports back to be redone until it got those answers.

Richard Kerr, a former deputy director of central intelligence, said in 2003 that there was "significant pressure on the intelligence community to find evidence that supported a connection" between Iraq and Al Qaeda. The C.I.A. ombudsman told the Senate Intelligence Committee that the administration's "hammering" on Iraq intelligence was harder than he had seen in his 32 years at the agency.

Mr. Bush and other administration officials say they faithfully reported what they had read. But Vice President Dick Cheney presented the Prague meeting as a fact when even the most supportive analysts considered it highly dubious. The administration has still not acknowledged that tales of Iraq coaching Al Qaeda on chemical warfare were considered false, even at the time they were circulated.

The president and his top advisers may very well have sincerely believed that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. But they did not allow the American people, or even Congress, to have the information necessary to make reasoned judgments of their own. It's obvious that the Bush administration misled Americans about Mr. Hussein's weapons and his terrorist connections. We need to know how that happened and why.

Mr. Bush said last Friday that he welcomed debate, even in a time of war, but that "it is deeply irresponsible to rewrite the history of how that war began." We agree,

but it is Mr. Bush and his team who are rewriting history.

NEW DAY FOR HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, contrary to what some of my friends on the other side of the aisle do, I like to take this time, morning hour, and share a little good news with the American people, because this is an exciting day. It is a new day for health care in our Nation. It is a day of great opportunity for seniors all across our Nation. Today is the first day that seniors all across America are able to sign up voluntarily and participate in the new Medicare part D prescription drug program.

As many members of Congress know, I am a third-generation physician, and the things that were available to treat patients by my father and my grandfather have changed so significantly. The kinds of things that I was able to use to take care of patients were remarkably different than those that my father and grandfather were able to use. Medicine is an evolving science, and it changes almost daily.

But the Medicare program, like most government programs, has not kept up. When Medicare started 40 years ago, there really were very few medications that were able to be used to significantly alter the course of a disease or to prevent disease. But a lot of things have changed. Over the past 40 years, there are wonderful opportunities that have been created with the use of drug treatments and medications to prevent and cure diseases.

Yet Medicare, until now, has not covered a single medication. None. The Medicare system would cover, for example, the incredibly expensive surgery to take care of an ulcer, but it would not cover the medications to prevent the ulcer in the first place. That Medicare would cover, for example, the expensive hospitalization or potential surgery to treat an individual who had a stroke but would not cover the medications that were available to prevent a stroke, itself, does not make any sense at all. But all that is changing, and all of that is changing beginning today.

I want to stress that this is a voluntary program, a voluntary program for all seniors. Most seniors, if they look at the options available to them, will be helped significantly and assisted in their purchase and the ability to purchase medications by this new program.

Some might argue that much of this will be confusing, and it may be at the beginning. All kinds of programs that start anew oftentimes have many things that are confusing in them. However, I encourage my colleagues, both in Congress and in the medical