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.